

8
A further

DEFENCE OF THE REPORT.

Vindicating it from

Mr. *Alsops* Cavils,

AND

Shewing the *Difference* between Mr. *W's*
and my self to be *Real*, and the Charge in
my *Appeal* to be True.

Cor. 4. 13. *Being defamed we entreat.*

L O N D O N:

Printed for Nath. Hiller, at the *Princes*
Arms in *Leaden-Hall-Street*, over against
St. Mary Axe, 1698.

TO THE READER.

M*T sincere Aim being still to clear the Truth, in order unto Peace, I have not only waved the Examination of the History, given by Mr. W. and Mr. A. which sundry Instances, is so very distant from Truth, that 'twill be difficult for them to bear a Detection ; But being assured by my Presbyterian, as well as other Brethren, that Mr. Alsop's Vindication of his Rebuke, is extravagantly provoking, I would not put my self to the pain of reading it. However, some worthy Persons, having examined that Rhapsodie, did send me that they apprehended needful for me to Answer ; which I have considered, and in the ensuing papers have given a Reply unto. And that what I thought necessary to urge, might be so delivered, as rather to induce unto, than drive from the things, which make for Peace, I have endeavoured to observe that Rule, the Larned and Pious Dr. Manton, now in Glory, hath on the Ninth Verse of Jude, given about Answering a Rayling, Scoffing Adversary. 'Do not (saith the Dr.) imitate him in his foolish passion, ---- But yet Answer him to the*

A 2

' purpose,

The Preface.

*' purpose, with solid Arguments: --- Beat down
' his Presumption and Ignorance with a meek
' Reply, such as may check his Pride, but not
' imitate his Folly.*

*There is one Calumny I must remove, but to do it
with that softness, which is most consonant to my
Inclination, Principles and Temper; the Nature
of the Thing will not easily allow: For which
Reason I was once resolved to say nothing of it.
But being assured, that the **Lye**, my Adversar-
ies have industriously attempted to spread through-
out the Land, is made their Principal Refuge:
For the sake of Gods Glory, my continued Use-
fulness in the Ministry, and that I may clear
my self from so vile a Reproach, most unjustly
cast upon me by Mr. Williams's and Mr. Alsop's
Innuendo's, Insinuations and Suggestions; and
the Lies they have sent down into the Country
as a Key to unlock their Meaning, That my en-
tring on this Controversie is to Disserve the Pro-
testant, and Promote the Popish Cause; And to
compass such base and unworthy ends, I am (they
say) engaged in the most villanous Attempts, I
must, and do solemnly declare; and if ever I am
necessitated to give a History of my Concernment
in this Affair, I doubt not but that I shall be able
convincingly to demonstrate, That there is nothing
more abhorred by me, than such **Methods**
and **Designs**, as are charged upon me; That
my sincere endeavour hath been, and still is, That
God may glorified, in a lasting Establishment of
the*

The Preface.

Protestant Faith ; And its well known to
those, who are most inwardly acquainted with me,
to the Consciences of these Accusers, That it
was my hearty Labour to serve, not only the Pro-
testants in general ; but my Dissenting Brethren
in particular, that occasioned their Enemies, as
well as mine to do their most to fasten these very
Calumnies upon me ; And I have a Letter of
Mr. Alsop's in my Custody to Testifie how Indu-
stiously and Faithfully, I did, to his knowledge,
serve the Protestant Dissenters. And ever since
I have been discharged from that Expensive Ser-
vice, I have confin'd my self to my Ministerial
Duty, extending my Correspondencies no fur-
ther than to matters relating to my Improvement in
Literature, the Service of Christs Churches, and my
family Concern ; conversing with very few be-
sides my own Brethren ; And in my Deportment
towards them and all others, I have obliged my
self to those Rules of Civility, which become a
Gentleman, a Christian, and a Minister of Christs
Gospel.

And I must add, That had I not been most
remote from the Guilt they now would cover me
with, Mr. Williams was so very well known to me,
his Spirit, his Principles, and somewhat else,
that I forbear to mention, that I would as soon
put my hand into the Fire, as engage in
Contrast, and adventure on his Displea-
sure. But my Innocency, which has oft passed
through the Ordeal, feared none of these
things.

Besides,

The Preface:

Besides, Had I been the Man, they represent me to be, I would never have undertaken the Defence of those Points, which are most opposite to what, they say, I would promote. But I would have fallen in with Mr. Williams, whose Notions have so near an Alliance with, and so natural a Tendency unto the Introduction of Popery; It being manifest, that Popish Designs can never be better carried on, than by bringing into Reputation, some main Branches of the Popish Religion; which is done effectually by Mr. Williams and some of his Followers, by their insisting on a Justification by Works, and their Arminianizing. But how my Zeal against those Doctrines, some of which are Popish, and others prepare for Popery, should be a Reason for their charging me with favouring that way, is beyond the Comprehension of Persons, whose Understandings are much larger than mine.

In a word, my Part in this Controversie, is to Tare up that Sovereign Drug, which the Jesuits planted in this Kingdom, to Purge Protestants (as they expressed it in their Letter to the Father Rector at Bruxills) from their Heresie. And they were Men of deep Judgment, sound in the Faith; and as great Enemies to Popery, as ever breathed in English Air; who in the Reign of King Charles I. discovered their Fears, concerning a Change in Religion, upon the daily growth and spreading of Arminianism, which in their esteem, was a cunning way to bring in Popery.

The Preface.

ery, whilst they Judged the Professors of these
Opinions to be the **Common Disturbers**
the Protestant Churches, and **Incendiaries**,
those Estates, in which they had gotten any
Head, being Protestants in show; but Jesuits
Opinion, and **Practice**. And it was no
small part of the Glory of King James I. and of
the House of Nassau, that they laboured to crush
the Errours, I Oppugne, as having a tendency
to introduce Popery; and **Supported** those
Divines who Defended the very Cause, for which
I Plead. And it's well known, that of all Armi-
ans, they who Socinianize in the Doctrine of
Christs Satisfaction, as Mr. W's doth, are the
most Dangerous:

It is not then a Design to promote the Popish
Interest, directly or indirectly, but a Detecting
the Craft and Errours of this Man, whose Prin-
ciples tend to the bringing in of Popery, that is my
Crime; from which neither their severest Me-
asures, nor the worst they can do unto me (I trust
in the mercy of the Lord) shall be able to divert
me. For as in former, so in this Persecution
from them, the Lord hath been and still is my
Strength, who in his own time, will not only
indicate all opposed Truth, but clear my Inno-
cency. Whether it be either pious or wise, for the
Hellens Brethren to leave such Charges upon an
Innocent Brother, to pass without Rebuke, I sub-
mit to their Consciences, knowing how hateful
Delators, when amongst Persons of an inferiour
Rank,

The Preface.

Rank, have been unto them, in whom could be found the least degree of Morality.

But however their Carriage may be towards me in this respect, I am not, I bless God, in the least gone off from my peaceable Principles or Temper being most desirous the Brethren, who are unfeigned Embracers of the Protestant Faith, would enter on such Methods as are most likely to Restore Peace upon the Foundation of Necessary Truth.

There is nothing more needful, that I can at present think of, to be spoken unto, unless what relates to Amyrald, which will require more room than is here left me.

S. L.

Books sold by Nath. Hiller, at the Princes Arms in Leaden-Hall-Street.

THE Divine Institution of Congregational Churches, Ministry and Ordinances, [as has been Professed by those of that Perswasion] Asserted and Proved from the Word of God. By Isaac Chauncy. M. A.

A Discussion of the Lawfulness of a Pastors Acting as an Officer in other Churches, besides that which he is especially called to take the Oversight of. By the late Reverend Mr. Nath. Mather.

A further

DEFENCE OF THE REPORT.

Was once, as I suggested in the *Preface* to my *Appeal*, Resolv'd against Answering some Objections, not only, as I then said, because it was so difficult for their Authors either to Contradiction; or forbear Personal Reflection; but, because what was objected, appeared to be very *Weak, Impertinent* and *Frivolous*: But, being assured by some Learned and Judicious Divines, who have Read Mr. *Alsop's* late *Rhapsodie*, passing by his *Rude* and *Uncomely* Invectives, false and Injurious Accusations; the whole of its strength lieth in Noise and Clamour, which he raises upon the account of my saying nothing to the purpose of his Trifling Objections; and, as he pretends to be surpris'd at my Quarrelling with my Brethren about matters of *no moment*, &c. I will, without giving my self the trouble of Reading *that Book* which hath fill'd the Hearts of his most Godly, Learned and Pious Friends with unconceivable Grief, Examine those Objections, which, when I wrote my *Answer*, I did not answer, and give some Reasons, I think the Differences amongst us are more

B

than

than *Verbal*, and that they are about some of the most *substantial* Articles of our Holy Religion.

Section I.

I will begin with what he *objects* against the Reporter, and my self.

His first Objection.

‘ That the Reporter has left out of his *substance* the Gospel, Regeneration, Conversion, Repentance, Holiness, Sanctification, a New Heart, and New Obedience, Good Works, &c. A blessed Report for a Countrey. You are eased at least of one Moity of your Work.

Reply.

In my Return, I will give you the Passage which he refers as it is in the Report, and then consider what Reason Mr. A. had for this Objection.

In the Report it's thus; ‘ That all, who believe might escape the Wrath to come, and have Everlasting Life, the Lord Jesus Undertakes for us, by making satisfaction to Punitive and Remunerative Justice, and, that he might do so, he did put himself in our Place, State and Condition; so that whereas we were Sin, and under a Curse, by this Blessed Change Christ is made Sin, and a Curse, and we delivered from Sin, and the Curse, 2 Cor. 5. 21. Gal. 3. 13.

‘ This is the substance of the Gospel of Christ, this the Ground, and Foundation of our Faith.

Out of this Passage it is, that Mr. Alsop fetches the Reason, why he chargeth the Reporter for leaving out his Substance of the Gospel, Regeneration, Repentance, &c. To which I answer.

I. That 'twill be very hard for them, who know the Person, that is thought to be the Reporter, to think it possible for Mr. A. to believe one word of his own Charge against him, it being in his own Conscience so contrary to Truth, and can therefore be no less than a Calumny, as *Calumniæ est cum quis*

Scientia, & dolo injustè agit, & excipit. But it
 must be further observ'd ;

2. That this Passage of the Reporter was only
 out Christ's Satisfaction, as it is an Article of
 simple Belief, and of distinct Consideration, either
 in Matters of Practice; or, such Works, as are
 wrought in us by the Holy Spirit.

That Matters of Simple Belief have been ever,
 the Churches of God, placed in a Formula, by
 themselves. And, if there be any strength, in the
 objection, it must lye in this, That whenever a
 formula is given of the Credenda, there must be
 added with it an Exact Catalogue of the Agenda;
 that whoever Composes a Summary of Matters
 of Simple Belief, without inserting in it the Agenda,
 Matters of Practice, doth thereby Reject out of
 the Substance of the Gospel Repentance, Good Works, &c.
 I say, lyeth the strength of his Objection,
 that if of any force at all against the Reporter, must
 condemn all the Churches of Christ from the Begin-
 ning under the same Condemnation, because they had
 no Credenda in a Formula by themselves.

The Reporter had in his Summary a word more
 than is in many of the Antient Creeds. For, he saith,
 that all, who Believe might escape the Wrath to
 come, and have Everlasting Life, &c. thereby
 implying Faith, which supposes Regeneration, and in-
 cludes within it the Entire Nature of Evangelical
 Repentance, and is Prolifick of Good Works, neces-
 sary to Salvation; and therefore so long as this
 passage, viz. [That all who Believe might escape
 the Wrath to come, &c.] continues in his Summa-
 ry, there will not be the least pretence for the Hor-
 ror-Noise he has made about it. But.

Mr. A. as one, whose Conscience had, whilst
 he was making this Objection, check'd him for it,
 added, [' But suppose this were intended only as

' the *Substance* of the Gospel so far as we are
 ' to *Believe* what Christ has done and suffered for
 ' Sinners *without them*, &c.] Well then, let us *sup-*
pose it, and see what will follow. Really, as for my
 part, I can observe *in it* nothing less than a Full
 Answer to his own Objection. For, if the *Report*
 intended no more than the Substance of what we
 are to Believe concerning what Christ has done and
 suffered for Sinners *without them* and *with God* (for
 really he did not) he was under no Obligation to
 mention Regeneration, Conversion, Repentance,
 Good Works, &c. which are wrought *in*, and upon
 Sinners, and the not mentioning 'em cannot be
 Reason a Rejecting 'em.

The Reporter was writing of the Substance of
 the Gospel so far as it concern'd the Article of
 Christ's Satisfaction: 'Twas no part of his Province
 to entreat of Regeneration, Conversion, Repen-
 tance, &c. And Mr. A. might have blamed him
 for not opening the Nature of Faith, Regeneration
 or Repentance, as well as for not mentioning either
them, or the Order in which they are wrought. And
 would it not be very wisely urged, The Reporter
 undertook to discourse of the Substance of one thing
 and therefore not speaking a word of another, of
 a distinct Nature, he must be interpreted to Re-
 ject that other, as if he who writes of *Botanicks*, must
 be look'd on as a denyer of the Existence of *Min-
 erals*, because he confines his Discourse to that
 matter in hand.

6. This Objection must be either the most
 fling one that ever was started; or be most Fer-
 of Blasphemous Absurdities. For, if when we
 course of *what Christ hath done*, and suffered for
ners, *without them*, the not mentioning Regene-
 tion, Conversion, Repentance, &c. be a Rejection
 of them, it must be because these things are Essen-

parts of Christ's Obedience and Sufferings; what
 more evident than that if Regeneration, Repen-
 tance, Good Works, &c. be not *Essential* Parts of
 what Christ has done and suffered for Sinners, the
Porter, when he gave the Substance of what we
 are to believe of Christ's Obedience, and Sufferings,
 that he did not mention Regeneration &c. cannot
 be justly esteemed a Rejecter of them; whence
 a good Man's pretences for his Charge against the
Porter (tho' on it, as is said by many, the Sub-
 stance of his late *Rhapsodie* depends) dwindles into
 nothing, and the Objection appears to be a most
 trifling one. But,

If Regeneration, Conversion, Repentance,
 Obedience, &c. be essential Parts of what
 Christ has done and suffered for Sinners without
 them, then 'twill follow, 1. That a Man may be
 regenerated, converted and sanctified; as well as
 justified and adopted by a mere external or relative
 change: And Regeneration, Sanctification, &c.
 import no more an *internal Physical* Change on the
 Heart and Life than Justification doth. For if they
 be the Essentials of what only is done without us,
 Christ's Obedience and Sufferings are acknowledg-
 ed to be in this Place, by Mr. A — himself, they
 may be as perfect in their own Nature, *without*
 Christ's Satisfaction is, which is a Notion, if
 it had been true, that would have been very useful
 to the *Libertines, Ranters* and *Debauchees* of the Age;
 tho' they make no Conscience of what they
 write or do; do nevertheless, please themselves
 in the conceit of their being in a blessed State, as
 regenerated, converted and sanctified; which, ac-
 cording to the natural and easie Consequence, that
 flows from what strength Mr. A's. Objection has in
 it may be without a work wrought in them. And
 it be thus, then Christ in doing and suffering for
 Sinners

Sinners, *regenerated, converted, sanctified them, &c.* and all this *without them*; they still remaining in themselves as Vile and as Vicious as ever. Again, 'twill follow

2. That if the *Substance* of what Christ hath done and suffered for Sinners, *without them*, cannot be given in a *Formula*, unless there be the mention made of Regeneration, Conversion, Repentance, new Obedience, good Works, &c. then our *Faith*, Repentance, new Obedience, &c. are included in what Christ hath already done and suffered for Sinners, *without them*, as if Christ had believed and repented for us, yea, as if he had done whatever was necessary for us to have done, in order to our *affliction*, Justification, Pardon, and entrance into the eternal Glory.

This is the way of my Adversary, who fears not to run upon the most dangerous Precipices, nor to give Advantage to the most malignant Hereticks, how ridiculously soever, when he fancies 'twill make against his Opposers. But,

7. That I may follow this witty Gentleman somewhat further, I will go on to consider what Use he makes of this Supposition, which carries it the genuine Sense of the Reporter, which he gives in these words. 'Here's something saith he in the Draught that gives cause of Suspicion, to those who are of no jealous Inclinations: For; where he informs us that Christ *suffered and satisfied, that all who believe might escape Wrath to come, and have everlasting Life*: Here's no necessity of Faith in order to Justification; no believing necessary to Pardon of Sin, or Peace with God; no Faith needful to Union with Christ, that we may have an Interest in his Righteousness, but only to *escape Wrath to come and the having everlasting Life*. To this answer. 1. What is here urged, being upon Supposition, that the Reporter intended only a summary

what Christ *has done* and *suffered* for Sinners with
 and with God, and not of the Order between
 and Justification, or Pardon; there is no
 room for suspicion in this Draught than there
 in the antient *Symboles*, in which not a word of
 his precedence to Justification or Pardon. And
 would an *Antinomian* imitate this learned Man, in
 way of arguing, would he not be as able to vin-
 dicate his most licentious Principles from the Apo-
 stles Creed, as Mr. *A.* is to fasten his Charge on the
 Reporter, and after his manner, professing an extra-
 ordinary Zeal for that Creed? press it, that there is
 necessity of Faith in order to Justification; because
 a word of it in that *Symbole*, though it contains
 the sum and substance of the Gospel. For, if
 it is not mentioned in the *Formula*, composed by
 the Reporter must be look'd on as rejected, because
 mentioned in it, then what is not in the *Formula*
 of the Apostles, must be also look'd upon as reject-
 ed by them, as if they had held, that Faith doth
 antecedent Justification, and is not necessary to
 Peace with God. But 2. Why doth he
 say *Here's no believing necessary to Peace with God?*
 when he think that a Man may escape the Wrath to
 come and have everlasting Life, tho' his Peace with
 God be not made? When it's said in Scripture, that
who believe escape the Wrath to come and have ever-
lasting Life? I thought nothing less could be meant,
 than that they had on their believing, Peace with God;
 as, (as *Beza, Piscator, Tolet, Estius, Pareus*, in *Poole*)
 Reconciliation; or (as *Vatablus (ubi supra)*) are re-
 conciled into Favour with God. 3. The Godly learned
 in their general Discourses about these Points, have
 thought it sufficient to secure themselves from
 scandalous Accusations, as Mr. *A.*—would fasten
 on the Reporter; if they did but mention *believing*, as
 necessary to our Deliverance from eternal Wrath, or

to our having everlasting Life. I might give a large catalogue of learned men on this occasion, but will only instance in the learned *Grotius*, who, in the *Summary* he gave of the *Catholick Faith* in this very Point has it thus, *at nos intercedente vera Fide, a Pœna Mortis æterna liberaremur.* This great Man, writing of *Christs Satisfaction*, saith, that *Christ* did it, that *by the Intervention of true Faith*, we might be delivered from the Punishment of eternal Death. But 4. The Reporter has one Passage more than *Grotius*, (who was never thought to reject the necessity of Faith in order to Justification) namely, and have everlasting Life. Thus much the Reporter took care to insert into the substance of the Gospel in this Article, having a regard to that Place in *John* 3. 36. *He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting Life.* That is, hath a Right to everlasting Life. *Habet, i. e. certo habiturus est*, as *Lucas Brugensis*, in *Poole*, who refers us unto *John* 1. 12. where 'tis thus, '*Jus ad hæreditatem quod & Hæreditatis nomine interdum venit, sicut qui credit (nempe sicut oportet credere; viva fide,) dicitur habere vitam æternam. C. 3. 36. Sic Juris consuetudo, is qui actionem habet ad rem ipsam, rem habere videtur.* Well then, the import of what the Reporter has here said, is, That *Christ* suffered, that they who believe may have a Right to everlasting Life, and seeing Justification carries in it a Right to Life eternal; it is as if it had been said, That they who believe may be justified. (5.) That this is the manifest intendment of the Reporter, may be seen by comparing the present Paragraph with the foregoing, which is,

'We are all by Nature under the Curse of the Law, and destitute of a Righteousness entitling to eternal Life.— That Vindictive Justice, which is essential unto God, makes it necessary, that the wrath be inflicted, and that there be no Right to eter-

nal Life without a perfect meritorious Righteousness. This is our State and Condition: This is the Place, in which we are, in which if we dye, we are eternally undone.

The Reporter having shown into what a deplorable Condition we are brought by Sin, and urging the necessity of an Interest, in a perfect meritorious Righteousness; he proceeds to show, how we may obtain such a Righteousness, as is meritorious of eternal Life, to the end we may obtain a right thereunto, saying, 'That all who believe might escape the Wrath to come, and have everlasting Life; the Lord Jesus undertakes for us; thereby clearing it, that they who believe having an Interest in Christs Righteousness, may have a Right to everlasting Life, that is, may be justified, so that here is an asserting of Faith as necessary to Justification, Pardon and Peace with God. (6.) The Reporter in giving this brief account of the Doctrine of Christs Satisfaction, hath followed the blessed Jesus, and the holy Apostles as his Guides; for our Lord when he sent out his Disciples to preach the Gospel, bids them declare, *That whoever believe and are baptized shall be saved, and they who believe not shall be damned.* In this Summary, though not one word expressly of Regeneration, Conversion, Repentance, &c. nor a word of the Precedence of Faith to Justification or Pardon of Sin; yet are all these included in it. The preaching of the Apostles was frequently the same, *Believe and thou shalt be saved.* But, (7.) If there had been any Strength in this Objection, Mr. A. might make, not only the Author of the Reasonableness of Christianity, and the rankest Socinians, but the very Mehometanes would be very much behold- ing to him for it. For, if the not mentioning every Article of the Christian Faith particularly in the Letter, where our Lord gives a Summary of

thk

the Gospel, must import a Rejection, or at least an Indifference about the Points not mentioned; then to believe that Jesus is the Messiah, is sufficient, and we may burn our Systems, Catechisms and larger Confessions of Faith.

But (8.) If he saith, it's mentioned by our Lord Jesus and his Apostles *elsewhere*, I grant it, and from thence I infer, that as our Lord's not mentioning these things, in a *summary*, is not a *Rejecting them*; so the Reporter, tho' he spake not a word of them in his *summary*, cannot without the greatest Injustice, and wrong done him, be charged, as a *Rejecter* of them. And (9.) It's not unworthy our observation, that the Lord Jesus did in *Mark* 16. 15, 16. give a summary of the whole Gospel without the mention of the particulars specified by my Adversary; but the Reporter only of the substance of the Gospel *so far as we are to believe what Christ has done, and suffered for Sinners without them, and with God*, in which he hath insisted on the necessity of Faith, in order to our escaping the Wrath to come, and our having Everlasting Life, which passage importing the necessity of Faith to our actual Right unto Glory, is as much as if it had been said, that it's necessary to our Justification and Pardon.

But Mr. A. it's likely, not thinking himself under those Bonds which oblige to a strict adherence unto Truth, in what he either saith, or writes, I have Reason to believe, that he hath charged the Reporter for Rejecting what he himself believes in his Conscience he holds, and that he hath done thus much, upon a Reason, which he is perswaded has nothing of strength in it; so dangerous a thing it is for a Man, who in his own Opinion, is a Great Wit, to enter on a Controversie, with a design to load his Opposers with False and Reproachful Charges, tho' it be to the cost and expence of his own Reputation,

tion, and in an Instance wherein he cannot expose the Reporter, but by casting dirt on the Cathick Church, and on his own *Understanding* too, giving Countenance to nothing so much as unto the vain Pretences of such Debauched Hereticks as the Licentious *Antinomian*, and *Libertines* of the Age are.

Thus, we see, whither somewhat has hurried this Man, and how he has brought himself into such Circumstances, as may move a Christian Temper to Pity and Compassion, for which reason I'll say no more to this *Objection*, but go on to a second.

The second Objection.

'Be pleased to observe. He instructs you, That we are all by Nature under the Curse of the Law, and destitute of a Righteousness, that may intitle us to Eternal Life, and that this was our Place, State and Condition.

Reply.

And was not this our Place, State, and Condition? Will Mr. A. deny it? No, he dares not; for, faith he, *This we all own, and lament as too true.* Where then is his Objection? It is in the following words.

'But then he instructs you also, That Christ put himself into our Place, State, and Condition: Will you not, must you not conclude from hence, That Christ also was destitute of a Righteousness to entitle him, and if himself, us too, to Eternal Life.

Reply.

1. That I may show how Mr. A. trifles in raising this Objection, I will propose the Sentiments of the Reporter about a Commutation of Persons between Christ, and us; which was the Occasion of what was said about our being destitute of a Righteousness. And it must be observ'd, that the Reporter had his Eye on the *Manuscript*, in which its Author, speaking of a proper Commutation, saith, 'That it is the same with a proper Surrogation, where the Surety

[Co:

¹ [or *Surrogate*] puts on the Person, and stands in the *Quality, State, and Condition* of the Debtor, and lies under the same Obligation he did to answer for him. Not that he apprehended the Agreement there is between Christ's Suretiship, and that amongst Men to be adæquate, and full; nor did he allude unto a *Creditor and Debtor* to insinuate, that whatever may be truly affirmed of them, in *Humane Courts*, might be safely applied unto *God, and Sinners*, as to Christ acting the part of a *Surety*: But, to explain how Christ came under the *same Obligations*, we stood; and by his Satisfaction, and Merit Redeems us from that miserable state and condition our sin had cast us into, and procures for us a Right to Eternal Life; And therefore in Obedience to the Holy Scriptures, he considered Jesus Christ as a Surety that came into the *State, Quality, or Condition* of Sinners, *so far, and no further*, than to come under the same Obligations, and Bonds with us, to answer for us, and do, on our behalf, what was impossible to be done by our selves. And that he might make this the more clear, he represented unto us that *State*, in which we all are by Nature, affirming, That we are all under the *Curse, destitute of a Righteousness, that may entitle us to Eternal Life*. And, that, except Satisfaction be made both to *Punitive, and Remunerative Justice*, it's impossible for us to be saved. For, seeing the Law, under which we were Created is of Everlasting Obligation, we stand bound thereby both to Obedience, and the Punishment, and until this *Debt* be paid, we cannot be Relieved.

This is our *State*, this is our *Condition*, and that they who believe may be brought out of this Place, State, and Condition, and have Everlasting Life, Christ came into *this Place*, into this *State, and Condition*, that is, he came under *those Bonds, and Obligations*

things that lay on us, that, by answering them, we might be the Redeemed, and Saved.

But, saith Mr. *A.* if it be thus, *Christ must be destitute of a Righteousness*; to which I reply, By no means; and if we consider how it is between a *Surety* and a *Debtor*, in our Courts, we may soon see the contrary. For, when one becomes *Surety* for another, he comes into the *Place, State and Condition* of that other, that is, under the *same Bonds and Obligations* to pay for him, what he could not do for himself. But, would any Man of Sense say, that the *Surety* coming into the same *State and Condition* of the *Debtor*, to pay his Debts for him, must be thereupon destitute of what is necessary in order hereunto? He comes into the *Place* of one who is *insolvent*, but must he therefore be himself *Insolvent*, and yet pay what neither the *Debtor* nor himself can pay? Thus you see what Mr. *A.*'s Objection is at last come to. But,

2. The *Righteousness* of which our *Discourse* is, answers that Law, which said, *Do this and live*; In the day thou sinnest thou shalt die; and it is to make Satisfaction both to *Punitive* and *Remunerative Justice*. For whatever some may impertinently object, it may be very safely said, that Justice distributes Rewards and Punishments, and therefore is rightly denominated *Remunerative* and *Punitive*. For though it's said, That Punishment is *merited* by, or is rather the *Demerit* of sin; and that the Sinner, when he bears the Punishment due unto him for his Iniquity, partakes of the *Reward* of *Unrighteousness*; yet none can with the least pretence to Reason, say, That *Punitive* and *Remunerative* are Terms in all respects *Coincident*. For, it's most notorious, that when *Believers* are, for the sake of *Christ's Righteousness* rewarded with *Eternal Life*, they are not then punished; though *Remunerative Justice* is then glorified, yet *Punitive Justice* is not so But.

But, being assured, that Mr. *Alsop* saith, these Terms of *Remunerative* and *Punitive* Justice are *Coincident*; I will give the Sense of some learned Protestants about it. *Gilbertus Voet*, a Man of good Learning and a right Calvinist, discoursing of the Justice of God, saith, that *Justitia Dei est vel in Dictis, vel in Factis. Posterior duplex scilicet Regiminis, & Judicii. Justitia Judicii est, quæ secundum Opera Mercedem retribuit. Estq; hæc duplex, vel, Remunerativa seu Præmiaria secundum Promissionem erga bene agentes; vel Correctiva erga male agentes. Quæ etiam distinguitur in Castigantem erga Filios, & Vindicantem, seu Punitivam propriam, & stricte sic dictam erga Reprobos.* Voet. Select. Disput. Pas. 1. Disp. de Jure & Justitia pag. 357, 358. And the learned Doctor *Owen*, in his *Diatriba de Justitia Divina*, saith the same, affirming it to be the general Sense of *Modern Divines*, not one of them who writ on the Divine Attributes, being of a different Opinion: And in the Margine, he makes particular mention of *Zanchy*, *Voet*, *Maresius* and others; directing us also unto Doctor *Ames* his *Cases of Conscience*; who in the second Chapter of his fifth Book, resolves this Question viz. Whether Remuneration or Punition belongs, to *Communicative* or to *Distributive* Justice? Whether Mr. *A.* understood these things or not, is not in my Opinion very material, it being sufficient to my purpose, that in the Judgment of wiser Men than himself these Terms are not so *Coincident*, as it's said he doth insinuate.

But to return, The Lord Jesus undertaking to make Satisfaction both to *Punitive* and *Remunerative* Justice, that is to say, the obliging himself to suffer the Punishment due to us; for the Satisfaction of *Punitive* Justice, and render Obedience to the same Law, to merit the Reward we had lost;

oft; the *Righteousness* the Reporter spake of, lieth
 bearing the *threatned Curse*, and in obeying the Pre-
 cepts of that *Law* we violated. And I demand of
 Mr. Alsop, Whether the Lord Jesus was always
 possess'd of this *Righteousness*? Had he it the
 first Instant of his undertaking? or when he first
 came into our *Place, State and Condition*?

That there was no Guile in the Mouth, nor De-
 ceit in the Heart of the blessed Jesus; That he
 was ever, even whilst he was in a State of *Exa-*
mination without Spot, Holy, Harmless, Undeiled,
 separate from Sinners, and at the greatest distance
 from the least Pollution or Impurity, we do firmly
 believe: And though he had not actually a *satisfying-*
meritorious *Righteousness* before, he did by his Pæ-
 nall *Sufferings*, and his perfect Obedience to the vio-
 lated *Law* satisfy and merit; yet was he at no in-
 stant of time destitute, of what in that instant it
 became him to have. But its like, nothing will
 satisfy Mr. A. but the granting, That either be-
 fore, or at his undertaking; or at least the *first*
moment of his entring on the work of our Redemp-
 tion, he was actually possess'd of a satisfactory
meritorious *Righteousness*, as if he believed, that
 Christ before he obeyed and suffered, did perfect-
 ly obey and fully satisfy. How else can he make
 hideous a Noise, about the Reporters holding,
 that Christ was destitute of a *Righteousness*, enti-
 tling himself and us too, to eternal Life? Once more.
 3. Mr. A—— blames the Reporter for suggesting
 if Christ had not a *Righteousness*, entitling himself
 to eternal Life. To which I answer,

1. That the Reporter, spake not about Christs ha-
 ving, or not having a *Righteousness* entitling himself
 to eternal Life. But, 2. Seeing Mr. A. doth infi-
 nite, That Jesus Christ hath wrought for himself
Righteousness, that he might by it be entitled
 to

to Eternal Life, I will consider the *Import* and *Tendency* of such an Assertion.

1. As for its *Import*, it cannot be any thing less than that the Lord Jesus Christ was once in a state of Tryal, and made under the same Law for *himself*, that we were for our selves, and that Obedience was required of him, to the end that he merit Eternal Life for *himself*: Whence it follows, That when the Promise of Eternal Life was proposed, for the Encouragement of his Obedience, he had no *Right* nor *Title* to Eternal Life; no, not for *himself*: But that to get a Title thereunto, he was under the Obligation of the same Law, that we were; and to speak most modestly of Mr. A's. Notion, The Lord Jesus Christ, God-Man, was antecedently to his rendring Obedience to the Law, which said, *Do this and live*. He was as destitute of a Right to Eternal Life, as *Adam* was on his first Creation. Thus, whilst he would fasten on the Reporter the groundless Charge of making Christ *destitute* of a *Righteousness*; he makes our Blessed Lord *destitute* of *Eternal Life*, ay, of a *Right* thereunto: But let us consider,

2. The *Tendency* of this Notion; and that I may do it with the greater clearness, I will deliver what I design to offer on this occasion; as pressed by the Learned, Judicious and Holy Doctor *Owen*, who in his Day excelled most Men in these Studies. And whoever will consult his Discourse of *Justification* from page 366 to page 378. will see, That this great Man in confuting the *Socinians*, and their next of Kin in the Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction and our Justification, doth with much concern, declare and strongly prove, That Christ came not under the Law for *himself*, but for *us*.

To set this Important Point in the clearer Light, it must be observed, That the Controversie is not, whether

whether the *Humane Nature* of Christ, as it is a *Rational Creature*, be subject unto the *Law* of Creation, and eternally obliged from the *Nature* of God, and its *Relation* thereunto, to *Love him*, *Obey him*, *depend upon him*, and to make him its *End*, *Blessedness*, and *Reward*. For as the Dr. admirably well expresseth it; 'The *Law* of Creation, thus considered, doth not respect the *World*, and *this Life* only; but the *Future State* of *Heaven*, and *Eternity*. But the Point here controverted is, Whether Christ be under the *Law*, as it is imposed on creatures by especial Dispensation, for *some time*, and for *some certain End*, with *some Considerations*, *rules*, and *Orders*, that belong not essentially to the *Law*, as before described, as it is presented unto us, not absolutely and eternally, but whilst we are in this *World*, and that with this special End, that by *Obedience* thereunto, we may obtain the *Reward* of *Eternal Life*?

To this the Dr. answers; That the Lord Jesus Christ was not made under the *Law*, under this consideration, for himself, to the end he might get a *Life* unto *Eternal Life*. 'For, (saith the Doctor) upon the first Instant of the *Union* of his *Natures*, being holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, he might, notwithstanding that *Law*, he was made subject unto, have been stated in *Glory*. For, he that was the Object of *all Divine Worship*, needed not any *New Obedience* to procure for him a state of *Blessedness*. And a little before. 'Setting aside (saith the Doctor) the consideration of the *Grace*, and *Love* of Christ, and the *Compact* between the Father and the Son, as to the *Undertaking* for us, which undeniably proves all that he did in pursuit of them to be done for us, and not for himself. I say, setting aside the consideration of

C

these

' these things, and the *Humane Nature of Christ*, b
 ' vertue of its *Union* with the Person of the Son o
 ' God, had a *Right unto*, and might have immed
 ' ately been admitted into the Highest Glor
 ' whereof it was capable, without any Antecedent
 ' Obedience unto the Law. And this is appare
 ' from hence, in that from the First *Instant of th*
 ' *Union*, the whole Person of Christ, with our Natur
 ' Existing therein, was the Object of all *Divi*
 ' *Worship* from Angels and Men, wherein consist
 ' the Highest Exaltation of that Nature. So f
 Dr. Owen.

Here then you see a difference between this Lea
 ned Dr. and Mr. A. Mr. A. suggests as if Christ
 were under the Law, which saith, *Do this and live*
 for Himself, as well as for us, that he might be e
 titled to Eternal Life; but the Dr. denies it upo
 the weightiest consideration. Besides, the Doct
 is the more positive in his Opinion, as it doth mo
 effectually subvert the Notion of Socinus, which i
 That our Lord Jesus Christ was for himself, or on h
 own account, obliged unto all that Obedience, which
 performed, and therefore could no more obey, an
 satisfie for others, than any other person. But th
 Doctor proves, That Christ's Obedience unto t
 Law was for Us, and not for Himself; and ther
 by doth most effectually enervate the strength o
 Socinus his Argument, which upon Mr. A's. Notio
 receives new Life, and Vigour.

Whoever desires a fuller understanding of th
 Controversie, will do well to consult the Doct
 himself; who, in the pages referred unto, hath
 fully, and clearly stated this Doctrine, as to obviat
 Objections, made against it by the Remonstrant
 Socinians, and others; but what I have here said
 sufficient to shew Mr. A's. Mistake, and what coun
 tenanc

...ance it gives the *Socinians*, and how much reason
 hath to be more in his Study consulting, not
 lay-Books for the sake of foolish Jest, but the
 Holy Scriptures, and the Learned Writings of D. O.
 and other Orthodox Divines, that for the future,
 through inadvertency, or otherwise, he give not those
 advantages to the common Enemies of our Holy
 Religion, he hath too oft done. But I pass on to
 third Objection.

The Third Objection.

We are sin, (saith the Reporter) and under a Curse:
 Can you, with all your Penetration, Divine the
 reason, why it's said, we are sin? —but how
 we *sin*? —why must it be phrased thus, *we are*
 ? It was Poetically and Satyrically said, That
 Alexander the sixth, was non tam vitiosus,
 quam vitium, non tam scelestus quam scelus: but
 we need to be taught how *Man was sin*? *sin* it
 of?

Reply.

That Mr. *Alsop* is so very much at a loss to
 out the genuine meaning of the word Sin,
 when it's said we are *Sin*, as if it had been never
 used in Scripture, doth not a little surprize; it
 being so common for the Holy-Ghost to express the
 comparative Degree by the *Abstract*, not only in
 other Instances, but even in this, that doth so puz-
 zle and confound him. For, as the Devils, whose
 sins are exceeding great, are called, πνευματικά τῆς πόρνης
 or spiritual wickedness, so wicked Men are cal-
 led Wickedness, particularly, in 1 Cor. 6. 9, 10, 11.
 There is an enumeration of sundry sorts of *Sinners*,
 I render it, [*And such were some of you*] ταῦτα δὲ
 it is, as may be seen in Poole; talia scelera eratis,
 Wickednesses were some of you; and as Ca-
 sarinus, ut cum Sceleratum dicimus Scelus. The

like also in *Ephesians* 5. 8. ye were *Darkness*, that is, as *Zanchy*, *ut Scelus pro scelestissimo*; and Bishop *Reynolds* observes, on *Psalms* 110. The Lord, to signify that his People were most *Rebellious*, saith, that they were *Rebellion* it self, *Ezek.* 2. 8. and many other instances of this kind might be given, which may move some of no jealous Inclinations, to suspect, that the Objector hath been more conversant with the *Poets*, than with the *Prophets* and *Apostles*.

2. Well then, by comparing Scripture with Scripture, the signification of the word [*Sin*] is very obvious, denoting the *greatness* of *Wickedness*; we are *Sin*; we are *Sin* in the *Abstract*, we are *Sinners* in the highest degree. But,

3. Doth not this Interpretation give advantage to the Objector, who saith, 'you shall see the mystery of his *Phraseology*; it was to mislead you, into that *Abomination*, that Christ was sinful, that he was a *Sinner*; for, if Christ was *Sin* in the same *Acceptation*, that we are, then he was *sinful*, he was a *Sinner*, and the greatest *Sinner*, that ever was in the World. To this I answer, That whatever ever is here suggested, my Interpretation of the word [*Sin*,] gives not the least advantage to the Objector. For,

1. If the word [*Sin*] has a Sense in the *Superlative Degree*, in which it is true, not only of *us*, but of *Christ*, without making Christ inherently sinful or personally guilty; all this noise is to no purpose.

2. That Christ was *Sin* in an *Acceptation*, that we are *Sin* without being Inherently Sinful, is evident; as the word [*Sin*] imports *Guilt*, I mean *Legal Guilt*, and a proper *Punishment* consequent thereupon. *Sin* in Scripture oft imports the same with

is, with *Legal Guilt*, in the Sense described by the
 learned Bishop of *Worcester*, and it also oft-times
 signifies Punishment. My *Sin*, and sometimes my
Guilt, at other times my Punishment ; and when
 many *Guilt* and *Punishment* are expressed by the word *Sin*,
 which are not only directed to our Sins as the *merito-*
rius Cause, but to the dreadful and dismal Effects.
 We are *Sin*, we are upon the account of our Trans-
 gressions exceeding *Guilty*, and the Punishment they
 deserve is exceeding great. But,

3. If Christ be not *Sin* in some of the same Ac-
 ceptions, in which we are *Sin*, then the Guilt of
 our Sins was never transferred upon Christ, nor the
 Punishment thereof inflicted on him ; which is a
 very liberal giving up the Controversie to the *Soci-*
etarians, who deny Christ to be made *Sin* in any one
 sense, in which we are *Sin*, and so will not own
 that our Guilt was laid upon him, or a proper Pun-
 ishment inflicted on him.

4. If Christ be in no Sense *Sin*, in which we
 be *Sin*, then our Sins were never imputed unto
 Christ, nor did he, in a proper sense, bear our *Guilt*,
 have *Punishment*, nor was he, nor could he be a *Proper*
Sacrifice for sin. To say, that Christ was a *Sacrifice*
 for sin, in a proper sense, and yet not *sin* in any one
 sense, in which we are *sin*, is to say he had not the
 Guilt, nor the *Punishment* of *sin* upon him, and that
 he was not a proper *Sacrifice* for *sin* ; for it's essen-
 tial to a proper *Sacrifice* for sin, to have the Guilt,
 and *Punishment* of sin laid upon it. Upon this ac-
 count it is that amongst the *Hebrews* the word
Chata is used for *sin*, the Guilt, the *Punishment*, and
Sacrifice. And amongst the *Greeks*, and *Latines* the
 same word signifies a wicked man, and an Expiatory
Sacrifice. ' Thus *vel. Sap. 12* is, as Dr. Owen against
Biddle, *cap. 22*. observes, *Homo piacularis pro Lu-*
stratione,

stratione, & Expiatione Patriæ devotus ; whence the word is often used, as *scelus* in Latin for a wicked man, a man fit to be destroyed and taken away. Agreeably hereunto, *Budaus* renders that place of the Apostle, 1 Cor. 4. 13. ὡς περ ἀεὶ καὶ δαπανῶμεθα — *nos tanquam piacula* — we are as the accursed things of the World, and Sacrifices for the People ; it being, as may be seen in *Poole in loc.* the Custom of some Countries, in the day of their Calamity, to take the vilest amongst the People, and Sacrifice them, who by the *Athenians* were called *καταδανῶνα* ; so common hath it been for the Sinner, and the Sacrifice to bear the same Name even amongst the Heathen ; but in the Holy Scriptures nothing more evident, because the Sin, for which the Sacrifice was to be offered was laid upon it in the Old Testament, whereby the Laying of our sins on the Lord Jesus, which was a necessary antecedent to his Death, as he was a Sacrifice, was prefigured. But,

5. Mr. *A.* writes, as if he had either never known or had quite forgot what is so very obvious to most Divines ; and therefore what he saith on this occasion is to be the less regarded, and to be considered as what can serve no other sort of People, than the *Socinians*, and their Allies, tho' I still charitably hope, that he abhors their Tenents, even when his Writings do, in too many instances, favour their Cause.

The Fourth Objection.

' That it is a mistake to conclude from Christ being called Surety, that therefore he came under the Sanction of the Law of Works. And the rather because being stiled the Surety of a better Testament can respect only the Covenant of Grace.

Reply.

1. I do not say that this is an Objection of Mr. *Alfop's*

Alfop's framing, nor will I answer it *as such*. The
 Episcopianism, and Socinianism, that is in it, is so clear
 evidence of its being formed by a Well-wisher
 to the Errours of our Adversaries, that I'll not
 ascribe it on one in whose Writings I have not met
 with it. But that 'tis of the same nature with
 that Mr. W. hath advanced, is to me most certain.

2. Whatever this *Objector* hath, with a boldness
 common amongst our Adversaries, asserted, I must
 have leave to suggest, that by this way of arguing,
 and by these Assertions, he hath left out Orthodox
 Writers, and is gone over to the Tents of *Limborch*,
Arcellæus, *Schlichtingtons*, and *Crellins*.

3. That herein the *Objector* has forsaken the Or-
 thodox, I will evince by setting down the Senti-
 ments of some of the most Eminent amongst them.
 And that I may be the more convincing in what I
 say, I must observe, that the hinge of this Contro-
 versie turns on a sound determination of this Que-
 stion, *viz. Whether Christ's Suretiship belongs to his Priestly*
Office, or not? For, if it belongs unto the *Priestly Of-*
ice, 'twill unavoidably follow, that *as our Surety*,
 our Lord Jesus offered up himself a *Sacrifice* to God
 for the Expiation of the Guilt of our sins, that to
 this end he took on him our Guilt, and bore the
 Punishment due to us, which he could not do but by
 standing under the *Sanction* of the *violated Law*. The
 Connection there is between Christ's Priesthood,
 and his offering up a proper Sacrifice, between his
 bearing a proper Sacrifice, and his bearing the Guilt,
 and Punishment of our sins; and between his bear-
 ing the Guilt, and Punishment of our sin, and his
 standing under the *Sanction* of the *violated Law*, is so
 close, so firmly fixed, and inviolable, that, on the
 supposing, that Christ's Suretiship belongs to him, as
 Priest, the whole here mentioned necessarily fol-
 lows.

lows. The Links are too strong to be broken. If then our Divines hold, that the Suretyship mentioned in *Heb. 7. 22.* belongs to Christs Priestly Office, if they produce *this Text* to prove, that Christ as our Surety took on him the Guilt and Punishment of our sins, to satisfy Gods Justice for them, then they do run counter herein, unto the *Episcopians* and *Socinians*, in holding that *Christ came under the Sanction of the Law.*

4. That, in what I have delivered, I have given the sense of the Orthodox is manifest. The Learned Bishop Reynolds on *Psal. 110. 4. p. 417.* saith, 'That Christ, being a Priest, must of necessity be a Mediator, and Surety between Parties, that he might have one, unto whom, and others, for whom, and in whose behalf to offer a Sacrifice. Every Priest must be a Mediator to stand between God and the People, and to intercept, and bear the Iniquity of their Holy things—— But every Mediator is not presently a Priest, for there is a Mediator only by way of Intreaty and Prayer, &c. And there are Mediators by way of Satisfaction, as Sureties are between the Creditor and the Debtor; and such a Mediator was Christ; not only a Mediator, but also a Surety of a better Covenant, *Heb. 8. 6. Heb. 7. 22.* He was not to procure Remission of our sins by way of Favour and Request, but he was set forth to declare the Righteousness of God, *Rom. 3. 25.* and such a Mediator between God and Us must needs be a Priest too. For the Debt, which we Owed unto God was Blood. Without shedding of Blood there is no Remission, *Heb. 9. 22.* *Essenius*, who is applauded for his Defence of *Grotius, de Satisfactione*, by *Lutherans*, as well as *Calvenists*, saith the same; 'Quantum ad Locum, *Heb. 7. 22. rationes à Crellio, allatas, cur Christus Sponsor Novi Foederis vocetur minime sufficere*

officere ostendimus, Sect. 1. hujus Libri. Inò in an-
 cedentibus, & consequentibus agitur de Sacerdotio
 Christi quo ipse non fungitur nomine Dei apud
 homines; sed nomine Hominum, apud Deum, cui
 victimam obtulit. Atq; Ita Sponsorem egit
 pro hominibus apud Deum. *Essen. Triump. Crucis,*
2. sect. 3. cap. 1. p. 500. Judicious Mr. Strong,
 his *Discourse of the two Covenants, lib. 2. cap. 2.*
§. 1. § 2. p. 128. has it thus; 'The Lord Christ,
 by becoming a Surety, did give his hand; that is,
 he did enter into Covenant with the Lord, and so
 his Name is put into our Bond, *Gal. 4. 4, 5.* He is
 said to be made under the Law, and that as a Co-
 venant; and when the Apostle saith, *He is the*
Surety of a better Covenant, whereas the main of
 Christ's Suretiship refers unto the first Covenant, the
 Covenant of Works broken, and therefore, in respect
 of our Debt, he is the Surety of the first Cove-
 nant; yet the Apostle doth not so express it, but of
 the better Covenant, because the Commutation of
 the Person, the bringing in of a Surety, doth
 properly belong unto the Covenant of Grace, and it
 is a part of the Covenant of Grace, that there should
 be *ἱλασμός*, or a Propitiation, one to stand in our
 stead, or to make Satisfaction to the Justice of God
 for the Breach of the Covenant of Works; and
 therefore the whole Suretiship of Christ doth refer
 unto the Covenant of Grace, of which his standing in
 our stead, and paying our Debt, is a principal part.
 To this of Mr. Strong I will add what Mr. Alsop
 saith about the Covenant of Grace, in his *Anti-Sozzo,*
717, &c. 'The Covenant of Grace may be con-
 sidered, either in its Constitution, or Execution:—
 In the Execution of the fixed Constitution—the Re-
 deeming Mediator Undertakes with God as a Righte-
 ous Judge—and therefore becomes a Priest, a
 Sacrifice,'

' Sacrifice, a Price, a Ransom, a Curse, to satisfy
 ' the Judge and his Law——Christ himself is promi-
 ' sed in the Covenant as the Great Comprehensive Bless-
 ' sing of the Covenant, *Isa. 49. 8, 9.* So that Christ
 being given in the Covenant of Grace, to Redeem
 us by his Death, and Sufferings, by his satisfying the
 Judge, and his Law, from that Misery, our sins had
 brought upon us, he might very well be stiled by the
 Apostle, *Heb. 7. 22.* a Surety of a better Covenant, of
 Testament, which shows the vanity of that part of
 the Objection, which saith, Christ cannot be said to
 come under the Sanction of the Law of Works, because
 being stiled the Surety of a better Testament, can
 respect only the Covenant of Grace. Once more.

The Learned Dr. Owen, in opposition to the In-
 terpretation given of *Heb. 7. 22.* by *Schlichtingius*,
Curcellæus, and *Hammond*, (and I may justly add to
 that given by Mr. W.) declares, ' That the genera-
 ' lity of Expositors, Antient, and Modern, of the Ro-
 ' man, and Protestant Churches, on the place, affirm,
 ' that the Lord Christ, as the Surety of the Cove-
 ' nant, was properly a Surety, or Undertaker unto God
 ' for us; and not a Surety, or Undertaker unto us
 ' for God. And because this is a matter of great
 ' importance, wherein the Faith and Consolation of
 ' the Church is highly concerned, I shall (saith he)
 ' a little insist upon it——It is the Priesthood of
 ' Christ that the Apostle treats of in this place,
 ' [*viz. Heb. 7. 22.*] and that alone. Wherefore
 ' he is a Surety as he is a Priest, and in the discharge
 ' of that Office, and therefore is so with God on
 ' our behalf——He undertook, as the Surety of
 ' the Covenant, to answer for all the sins of those,
 ' who are to be, and are made Partakers of the
 ' Benefits of it; that is, to undergo the Punishment
 due unto their sins; to make Attouement for them
 ' by

offering himself a *Propitiatory Sacrifice* for the
 Expiation of their sins, Redeeming them by the
 Blessing of his Blood from their State of *Misery*,
 and *Bondage* under the Law, and the Curse of it.
 Isa. 53. 4, 5, 6, 10. Matth. 20. 28. 1 Tim. 2. 6.
 1 Cor. 6. 20. Rom. 3. 25, 26. Heb. 10. 5, 6, 7, 8.
 Rom. 8. 2, 3. 2 Cor. 5. 19, 20, 21. Gal. 3. 13. And
 this was *Absolutely Necessary*, that the Grace and
 of Glory prepared in the Covenant, might be com-
 municated to us. This, and much more to the
 same purpose hath the Learned Dr. in his *Disc. of*
Justif. p. 256, &c. To whom I will only add what
 the Learned Author of the *Interest of Reason in Re-*
ligion offers on this Point. 'Whereas *Christ* is styled
 In (saith he) the *Surety of a better Covenant*, it be-
 cause the Enacting of the Covenant of Grace re-
 spects his Undertaking to be made *sin*, and to un-
 dergo the Curse as the *Moral Cause and Condition*;
 without which there had been no Overtures of
 Mercy made to the Sons of Men, p. 537, 538.

5. What these Great Men have here delivered,
 doth not only testify to the Truth of what I have
 affirmed about the Opposition the Orthodox have
 made against the Interpretation given of Heb. 7. 22.
 of Mr. W. Curcellæus, and the Socinian; but it also doth
 most convincingly prove, that *Christ's Suretiship* be-
 longs to his *Priesthood*, that in his Acting the part of
 a *Surety*, or in the Execution of his *Priestly Office*,
 he Offered up himself a *Sacrifice*, took on him our
 Guilt and Punishment, and, to this end, came under
 the Sanction of the violated Law. For,

6. The connection the Apostle affirms to be be-
 tween *Christ's Suretiship* and his *Priestly Office* is
 such, that a denying *Christ* to be a *Surety*, under-
 taking to bear the Guilt and Punishment of our sins,
 or that he came under the *Sanction of the Law*, to
 satisfy

satisfie God's Justice for us, hath a direct tendency to subvert the true Notion of the Priestly Office. Of this *Schlickingius* was so sensible, that he could think on no way (as *Dr. O.* observes) to solve the Apostles mention of Christ's being a *Surety* in the Description of his Priestly Office, but by overthrowing the Nature of that Office also. Of *Justif.* p. 261, 262, 263. Have we not then reason enough to be concern'd to see any, amongst our selves, turning aside from the *Common Faith* delivered to us from the Lord Jesus, and his Apostles, and falling in with the Inveterate Enemies of our Saviour's Satisfaction? One thing more I must note,

7. That the *Notion, Paraphrase, and Exposition*, given by *Socinians*, and a few other Authors, of Christ's being made, and called our *Surety*, because of his *Undertaking to be Pledge, and Guarranty* for God to Sinners, that upon their Repentance and Faith he will both pardon, and bestow upon them Eternal Life, is no ways either consistent with, or to be reconciled unto what the same Apostle had declared, *chap. 6. p. 16, 17.* where, tho' he had been discoursing of Christ's Priestly Office, he doth nevertheless expressly, and positively affirm, that God's Word of Promise, accompanied, and ratified by his Oath, is the whole, and that præclusive of all other means of *Security, and Assurance*, which we either need; or, that God hath in this matter been pleased to afford us, in order to the *steadfastness* of our Faith, the *Fulness* of our Consolation; God being willing more abundantly to shew unto the Heirs of Promise the *Immutability* of his Counsel confirm'd it by an Oath, that by two *Immutable things*, in which it was impossible for God to lye, we might have a strong Consolation, who have fled for Refuge, to lay hold upon the Hope set before us. So that the Reason of his being styled the

the *Surety* of the *better Testament* is, because of his suffering and performing those great Things for us towards God, without which the *Testamental Inheritance* bequeathed in that better *Testament*, would not have been upon any Terms accruable unto, and claimable by us.

The Fifth Objection.

'That by saying Christ sustained *the Person* of Sinners, Mr. L. must be thought to acknowledge, That he dyed for the *Reprobate*, as well as for the *Elect*, and that it favours the *Nestorians*, who maintain, That Christ was constituted of *two Persons*.

Reply.

1. What is objected against me in these words, as much against the generation of the *Orthodox*, who use the same Phrases which I do. Not that I intend only the *Lutherans* in this Instance, who are chiefly concern'd in the first part of the Objection, or I use it in no other sense than the Reformed generally do.

2. The Confusion which the Author of this Objection is fallen into, in his opposing the Phrase of *Christ's sustaining the Person* of Sinners, has moved some to fear, that all things are not Right with him. For one while this Phrase can signify nothing less than that *Christ puts on the Disguise* of Sinners (*Horresco referens*) and Acts the part of a *Stage-Player*; at another time, it must import *Nestorianism*, as if Christ had taken on him the *Natural Person* of Sinners; And again, the Enquiry is, whether the Persons of Sinners are not *United*, and to be considered as *One Person*, and whether Christ did not die and satisfy for that *One Person*, that is for all *equally*, which he doth not believe to be our sense, as he declares. But,

3. The

3. The sense, in which we use this Phrase, is known to Divines of the least acquaintance with these Studies, so that unless there had been a fault somewhere, the Objector could not have been thus puzzled, for it hath been cleared in my *Defence*, that when its said Christ *sustained the Person of Sinners*, it's not meant that the Person he took on him, was either a *Feigned* or a *Natural Person*, that it was only a *Legal Person*; so that, did he understand what is most plain and easie, he could not but see that he had not the least Pretence for his Blasphemous Representation of our blessed Saviour's Acting the part of a Stage-Player; nor for his charging us with *Nestorianism*.

4. As for his Endeavour to infer from this Phrase of [*Christs sustaining the Person of Sinners*] the Doctrine of *Universal Redemption*, is so destitute of the least colour of Reason, that as he believes we do not hold it, so it hath no Foundation for its support: For the Phrase of [*Christs sustaining the Person of Sinners*] and that other of [*Christs dying for Sinners*] is of one and the same Extent, and the Interpretation given by the Orthodox of the one, is sufficient to vindicate the other from his trifling Cavils. But,

5. When we say, That Christ sustained the Person of Sinners, we mean it of those *Sinners*, who are given by the Father to the Son, whom the Father will draw unto him, who come to the Father by the Son, do believe are Converted, Regenerated and Saved. In a word, we mean it of *Elect Sinners*.

The Sixth Objection.

' That it is both *Scandalous* and *Blasphemous* to say,
' That *Pestilent Doctrines* have been oftentimes *Communicated* in the Language of Scripture.

Reply.

1. When I wrote my *Defence of the Report*, observing how zealous Mr. W's and his *Substitute*, were for strict Adherences unto Scripture words, and how much against the use of some *Terms* and *Phrases* (chosen by the *Orthodox*, to explain the Truth) because not in the Letter of Scripture, I thought it necessary to suggest in my *Defence*, as did, p. 59. That it hath been the way of the *Hereticks* to Quarrel with such *Terms* and *Phrases* as the Church had chosen, because not found in the Letter of Scripture; adding, That amongst many others, it's well observ'd by the Learned Mr. Norton of *New-England*, That the most *Pestilent Doctrines* have been Communicated in the Language of Scripture; upon which (as I am told) Mr. *Alsop* briskly delivers his charitable Censure, *viz.* That to say so is both *Scandalous* and *Blasphemous*. But,

2. What Mr. Norton said is *Matter of Fact*, in Point whereof the Truth is too Notorious to be denied. And may we not transmit to *Posterity* the wretched and villanous Practices of Vile *Hereticks*, without falling under the censure of being both *scandalous* and *Blasphemous*?

3. If it be *Blasphemous* to relate a Matter of this nature, some of the most *Judicious* and Learned *Historiographers* and *Fathers* of the Church, such as *Eusebius*, *Theodoret*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *St. Jerom*, *Austine*, and many others, who have faithfully related, with much clearness detected the Frauds and confuted the detestible Errors of *Hereticks* be Guilty. And whoever will escape this Mans *Menaces* and *Threatnings*, whilst they behold the *crafty Methods* of the *Enemies* to our Holy Religion, tho' subversive of the Truth, and ruinous to the Souls of Men, must tamely look on, and not speak

Speak one word of them, because they deliver their Pernicious Doctrines in Scripture Language. But

4. As in all ages of the Church, *Hereticks* have had their *Advocates* to plead their Cause, or at least to extenuate and speak favourably of their Errors in like manner, there have not been wanting some who tho' to the hazard of their *Liberty*, their *Reputation* and Lives, because of malicious *Intreagues* and Invidious Designs of *Erroneous Delators*, have discovered the Cheat, oppugned the Errour, and defended the Truth.

5 That it hath been the way of *Hereticks* to act deceitfully, and communicate their Pesteilious Notions in Scripture Language; I will, for the sake of the Objector, and such as want either Ability or Opportunity to consult Church History, or the Fathers, shew out of *Kracanthorp*, who, in his *Treatise of the fifth General Council*, held at *Constantinople* under the Emperor *Justinian*, making a very strict search into these matters, comes at last to this Conclusion, viz. ' That the *Nestorians* spake like Catholics, but thought otherwise: Their Words were holy, and *Orthodoxal*, but their Sense and Meaning was *Blasphemous*, and *Heretical*. Neither was this any New Policy of the *Nestorians*; the *Arians*, the *Pelagians*, almost all *Hereticks* have practised the like. Out of them all (saith he) I will here alledge but one Example. *Vitalis*, a *Presbyter* of *Antioch* was accused unto *Damasus* to maintain in some part the *Heresie* of *Apollinaris*, as denying *Christ* to have a Soul or Mind; at the motion of *Damasus* he delivered in Writing a Confession of his Faith — In this Confession *Vitalis* had placed the very words of the Scripture, not depraved nor any way changed, neither the Order, nor the Writing of them being corrupted. But, when

neither came among his own Fellows, to them he
 opened his *secret meaning* and his *fraud*. Whence
Wakenthorp observes, That an *Heretical Profession*
 may be made in the very words of holy Scripture;
 which is, as if it had been said, *Pestilent Doctrines*
 may be communicated in Scripture Language. And
 must add,

6. That as it hath been a common practice of
Hereticks, to keep most rigidly to the *Letter* of Scrip-
 ture; and from time to time, provoke their *Ortho-*
dox Opposers thereunto; so, the *Church*, to the end
 it might the more effectually discover the *Heresie*, &
Heretick, explain and defend the Truth, did always
 choose apt *Words, Terms, and Phrases*, from which the
 power of *Hereticks* could never prevail with her
 to turn.

Doctor Owen, in the *Preface* to his *Answer unto*
Blasphemy, speaks very fully unto this Point, declaring,
 that it has been his observation, ' That such *Words*
and Expressions, as are not *expressly* found in Scripture,
 have been *Questioned* and *Rejected* by none but such as
 by their *Rejection* intend and aim at the *Removal*
 of the Truth it self, which by them is expressed
 and plentifully revealed in the Word. Hence
 when *Valens* the *Arian* Emperor, sent *Modestus*
 the *Pratorian Praefect*, to persuade *Basil* to be an
Arian, the Man intreats him not to be so rigid as
 to displease the Emperor, and trouble the Church, for
 an *Over-strict Observance* of *Opinions*; it being but
 one Word, indeed one Syllable, that made the
 difference. And he thought it not *Prudence* to stand
 so much upon so small a Business. The Holy Man
 reply'd, *However* Children might be so dealt withal,
 those who are bred up in the Scriptures, or nourished with
 the Word, will not suffer one Syllable of *Divine*
 Truth to be betrayed. The like attempt of this of

D

'Valens

' *Valens* and *Modestus* upon *Basil*, was made by the
 ' *Arian* Bishops at the Council of *Arminum*, who
 ' pleaded earnestly for the Rejection of one, or two
 ' Words, not found in Scripture, laying on the Plea
 ' much weight, when it was the Eversion of the
 ' Deity of Christ, which they intended and attempted.
 Thus Doctor O. ubi supra. p. 21.

7. After the same manner, in the present Controversie, my *Adversaries* make an amazing Noise crying out that the Quarrel is only about some Words, Terms, Phrases and Expressions, such as Change of Persons, Christ sustaining the Person of Sinners, &c. which are neither in Scripture, nor in any Publick Confessions, and thus make a horrid strife about Words, when there is an agreement in things; calling upon us, to show the Scripture, that hath the controverted Words and Phrases literally in them, which you see from what I have urged out of Dr. Owen is an old Practice of *Hereticks*: I will further show out of the Learned Dalley, who in his *Demonstration of Faith from Scripture*, gives a particular account of the Reasonings of the *Antient Hereticks*, and of what *Answers* the Fathers returned unto them.

This great Man Notes it as the Practice of *Arians* and other *Hereticks*, to provoke to the Express Letter of Scripture, for the use of thole Terms and Phrases that were then controverted. For instance, ' Where is it (say they) in the Letter, that the Son is Consubstantial with the Father, where in so many Words and Syllables? Away with your Sylogisms, and show where nakedly and literally its said, that the Son is the True God. So *Pascentius* Comes an *Arian*, in St. *Austin*, In what Text is the word *Omoousios*, or Consubstantial? And in *Victor Vitenfis*, its said, that *Hunnericus*, an *Arian* King

King of the *Vandals*, in an *Edict*, by which he commanded the *Catholick Bishops* of the *Affrican Churches* to meet with Men of his own Opinion about Matters of *Faith*, would have them show the *Faith* of the *Omoousians* to be in so many *Letters* and *Syllables* of *Scripture*. But,

8. This way of Arguing was exploded by the *Others*, as *Absurd* and *Foolish*, who constantly asserted, That altho' what they belived was not to be found in so many expresse *Words* and *Syllables*, yet it was it very clearly and manifestly deduced from *plain Scriptures*. And as *Athanasius* expressed it, *in matter, whether what, we believe be in so many words of the Scriptures, so long as the Truths themselves are therein Contained. That is said to be Written, altho' not in the very Letter, if the Sense of it be there. So Chrysostom.* To which add, that of *Gregory Nazianzen*, there are some things in *Scripture* intended, which are not *Literally expressed*; there are other things *Literally mentioned* but are not really intended, &c. Thus though it is not in the *Letter* said, 'That God is *Impassible*, without *beginning*, &c. Yet these things are by other words intended: Again, altho' it be in the *Letter*, that God *sleeps, awakes, moves*, yet are they not really meant. *Dal. Ubi. sup. Cap. 7. and 8.*

9. This Learned Person induceth sundry other *authorities*, and at last refers to his *Appendix*, in which is a *Treatise* of *Theodoret* (which has been inserted in the Works of *Athanasius*) against 'em, who are for a rigid, and stiff Adherence unto the very words of *Scripture*, without any regard to their *Contsonancy*, or *Dissonancy* unto *Reason*, or the *Analogy* of *Faith*; or *Mysteries* of the *Gospel*, which the *Father* doth thus expostulate with 'em. What shall I believe with my *Heart* unto *Righteousness*?

ousness? What shall I *confess* with my Mouth unto
 ' Salvation? when it's *maliciously objected*, That the
 ' Father who hath sent me is greater than I? shall I
 ' hastily assent unto it as thus *simply Delivered*, and
 ' boldly deny the Son to be equal with the Father? Must
 ' I not at all weigh the matter, nor consider that
 ' this is to be understood in regard to the *Oecono-*
 ' *my and Dispensation*? May I not observe what is
 ' said elsewhere of the Father and the Son's being
 one, and that we must honour the Son as we
 honour the Father?

10. To gather up what hath been briefly suggested, tis manifest that Hereticks have communicated Pestilent Doctrines in Scripture Language; that they have been for a rigid Adhesion unto the very words, syllables and letter of Scripture; That they would Reject those Terms and Phrases, used by the Orthodox to explain the Truth, and distinguish it from Error; because not in the Letter of Scripture; That the Church would not part with a word, a syllable, nor with a Letter, that was necessary to express the Truth. The Council of Nice would not gratify the *Arians* nor *Nestorians* in a Letter, saith Dr. Manton on Jude p. 163. That the Opposers of Orthodox Terms and Phrases, always did it with a design to *subvert the Truth*. But, if it be Blasphemous to detect the fraudulent Practice of Hereticks, what Fence can we have against a *Vitalis*, a *Biddle*, a *Socinian* or *Arian*? I might enlarge and expose, but I will forbear, and Apply my self to the Consideration of the next.

The Seventh Objection.

' Mr. Lobb leaves out a considerable word in his
 ' translating a part of the *Scotch Confession* p. 81.
 ' —There's a word [*QUASI*] which he did
 ' not think for his purpose to *English*. He ought to
 have

have said, And to appear [as it were] in our Person, that is, that Christ appeared not *properly* in our Person.

Reply.

1. When I did, in answer to the Request of several learned and judicious Brethren, undertake to examine the Writings of Mr. *W.* I found his Attempts to be so like, what had been used by Men sound in the Faith, who have made it their Business, for a while to conceal their own Notions, and seem to quarrel rather with the *Terms and Phrases* chosen by the Orthodox to Explain the *Truth*; than with the *Truth* it self; that I could do no less than take notice of it to my Brethren, who having not been so forward, as I think they should, to give check to his Career, have (though not *designedly*) encouraged him and his Partizans, to make furtherursions on the controverted *Terms and Phrases*, and insinuate, that the whole contest is but about words.

2. This being the way and method of my Opposers, I did in my Defence, carefully endeavour to culcate it, that we contend for the *controverted Phrases*, only, as they are expressive of what is *essential* to a *real, proper and plenary Satisfaction* to Gods Justice for our Sins, so that in good earnest, the contention is about the great and necessary Doctrine *Christs Satisfaction*, and for the *Terms and Phrases* otherwise than as they are expressive of this doctrine.

3. That I might bring our true and genuine Cause into so clear a Light, as not to leave the least shadow of Reason for one doubting thought, about what it was I expressly declared, 'That if I did but direct to the Confession, where either a *proper Satisfaction* is asserted, or, where 'tis said,

‘ that Christ, as our Surety suffered for us ; or that
 ‘ Christ suffered in our Place and Stead, or stood in
 ‘ our Person when he died ; it might I hoped, satisfy
 ‘ any unprejudiced Person ; that the Phrases contended
 for, are in our Confessions, that is, The thing they signify,
 and for which we plead, is there ; thereby shewing,
 that it is the Doctrine, which these Terms and
 Phrases do most aptly, and with the greatest Clear-
 ness and Distinction, convey unto our Understand-
 ings, that we are for.

5. That these *Termes* and *Phrases* are not of our
 Invention, but have been (as I have in my Defence
 unanswerably proved) used by the Orthodox in
 their Opposition unto the *Arminians* and *Socinians*,
 in a Sense known both to our Divines and their Ad-
 versaries. And that it hath been the trick of He-
 reticks and their Favourers, to raise Doubts and
 Scruples about their meaning and usefulness ; As,
 on the other hand, it hath been the constant Prac-
 tice of the Church (as I have already suggested) to
 defend them, — as they are most apt to explain
 the Truth, and distinguish it from Errour.

For which Reason, as soon as I have cleared my
 Translation of the *Scotch* Confession, and detected
 the Impertinence and Folly of some other Cavils,
 I will go on to the second Point I have proposed
 to discourse of, and shew, that the Controversie I
 have with Mr. W. is about the *Doctrine* of Christ's
 Satisfaction ; that the Difference is Real, in an Ar-
 ticle that affects the *Uitals* of Religion. But,

6. The Phrase of [Christ's sustaining our Person]
 has been generally received by the Orthodox, as ex-
 pressive of what's *Essential*, unto a real and Proper
 Satisfaction, even of what Christ did, to the end,
 he might appear before Gods Tribunal, under the
 Guilt of our Sins, and bear a proper Punishment for
 them.

bat them. To suppose the Lord Christ to be guilty in his own *Person*, is as if it had been said, He had seen in himself a Sinner, unclean, unholy: But to consider him as our *Surety*, sustaining the Person of Sinners, and so to charge on him the Guilt of our Sins, cannot in the least defile or pollute his holy and righteous Soul. It hath been therefore affirmed by the Orthodox, that the Lord Jesus sustained his own and our *Person*. As considered in his own *Person*, he is most remote from the Guilt and Filth of Sin. As standing in our *Person*, so he is covered with the Guilt of our Iniquities, tho' not touch'd with the least *Moral Filth*.

7. The Phrase of *Christs sustaining* our *Person*, must be taken in *Sensu forensi* in *Law-Sense*, importing, that as a *Surety* doth *in foro soli*, represent the debtor, so the Lord Jesus Christ, when at the Tribunal of the Father, represented those Sinners, whose Redemption and Salvation he had undertaken, and whether it be said, that Christ *doth put on*, or *sustain*, or *bear our Person*; the meaning is the same, and they who speak, as if these three words of [*putting on*, *bearing* and *sustaining*] the *Person* of Sinners, had as many different meanings; do talk as if they understood not the genuine Import of the Phrase. The same is true of the Latin Phrase, *Christus sustinuit Personam nostram*; *Christus sustinuit quodammodo*, seu, *quasi Personam nostram*] or the English, [*Christ did sustain our Person*, *Christ sustained as it were our Person*] the signification is the same, or whether *quodammodo* or *quasi* be added or not, the meaning is, That Christ did in *Sensu forensi* bear our *Person*. Take the word [*Person*] in *Law-Sense* and there is no need of the word *quodammodo* or *quasi*; but if the word *Person*, Import a natural or proper *Person*, then to ascertain the meaning to be

be *Forensic*, it's requisite to add, either *quasi* or *quodammodo*: For, *Persona moralis est quasi Persona propria*. And accordingly our Divines, do indifferently use the Phrase, with or without *quasi* or *quodammodo*; for whether they use either of these words or not, the Sense is known to be the same, and the meaning of them who have it, and who have it not is, That Christ took on him our Person in *Sensu forensi*, in *Law Sense*, as I have cleared it in my Defence p. 24, 25, &c. so that I have not the least reason to scruple the adding that considerable word [*quasi*,] and for the sake of a weak Brother am content to do it, at any time when desired. For,

8. If the words [*Christ sustained our Person*] signify somewhat really different from [*Christ's sustaining as it were our Person*] then it must be owned, that many Orthodox Divines, who have been thought to be of a mind, do really differ in this Point from each other. And many learned Persons, who express themselves with the greatest accuracy and caution, affirming sometimes, that *Christ sustained our Person*, and at other times as *it were our Person*, do really differ from themselves, particularly Calvin, who on 2 Cor. 5. 21. saith, [*That Christ did suscipere quodammodo personam nostram*] and on Gal. 3. 13. [*personam nostram suscepit*,] quarrell'd with himself or at least either the Reverend Mr. Poole, or Marlorat did misrepresent Calvin on 2 Cor. 5. 21. For as Marlorat gives the Sense of Calvin thus, *personam nostram quodammodo suscepit Christus, ut Reus nostro nomine fieret, & tanquam Peccator judicaretur, non propriis sed alienis Peccatis*; so Mr. Poole thus, *Christus autem Personam nostram suscepit, ut Reus nostro nomine fieret, & tanquam Peccator judicaretur*. So that the learned Mr. Poole is fallen into the very Error, Mr. W. and his Defendor charge on me; for

as I am accused for leaving out that *considerable* word [*quasi*.] Mr. Poo'e has left out as *considerable* a *quodammodo*. But whether Mr. P. or these Gentlemen be the most skill'd in the Latin Tongue and the *Civil Law*, is not over difficult to determine. Once more,

9. My Learned Adversary, Mr. W. adds, that I ought to have said, [*And to appear [as it were] in our Person, that is, Christ appeared not properly in our Person.*] To which I answer,

1. What he means by this Passage [*Christ appeared not properly in our Person,*] is not easy to understand. If he means, that Christ did not take upon him, nor appear in our *natural* or *proper Person*, I have over and over said it, it being most manifest, that he appeared only in our *Legal Person*, which is what Mr. W. doth expressly oppose. The thing he is against is, Christs taking on him our *Person*, in *Sensu forensi*, in *Law Sense*.

2. This word therefore [*properly*] if he will in Opposition unto me, abide by his Notion, that Christ did not take on him our *Person* in *Law Sense*, must be tacked to [*Christs appearing,*] as if he had said, Christ did not *properly appear* before the Judgment Seat of God to answer for our Sins, but only *improperly*, or *Metaphorically*. But,

10. Had it been said, That Christ did as it were, take on him our *Legal Person*, 'twould have been to his purpose, and have signified no more than that Christ did not really and truly take on him our *Legal Person*. But not a word of this in the *Scotch Confession*. There it is clear, that the Lord Jesus did appear before the Judgment Seat of the Father in our *Legal Person*, which was the point for which I produced it. And altho' the [*quasi*] is in the *Latin*, and [*as it were*] in the *English*, yet the

the Doctrine therein contained, is most opposite to what is advanced by Mr. *W.* and his more learned and upright *Corypheus*, as I hope, to the Conviction of an unbyassed Reader to evince. For the differences amongst us are *real*, in matters of the biggest Importance, and nearest Concernment to our Immortal Souls.

Sect. II.

The present Differences more than Verbal, being about an Article, that affects the Vitals of our Holy Religion.

In my Appeal to the learned Bishop of *Worcester*, and the Principal of *Jesus Colledge, Oxon*, I charged Mr. *Baxter*, whose Notions Mr. *W.* labours to propagate, for denying Christs sufferings to be properly *Panal*. And I have received a Line from a learned Friend, intimating, that Mr. *Alsop* hath these words in his late *Rhapsodie*. 'The Charge against Mr. *Baxter* is notoriously false, all the Authors Tricks to force him to deny the Sufferings of Christ to be proper Punishments.

In this Charge the Heart of the Controversie betwixt us doth lye, and if I make it good against Mr. *Baxter*, I doubt not but that my Orthodox Brethren amongst the *Presbyterians*, will acquit me from those Censures they now load me with.

The thing that lyeth on me to prove, is, That Mr. *Baxter* denyeth our Sins to be the meritorious Cause of Christs Sufferings; or, that his Sufferings are a proper Punishment.

That this Charge sounds harsh in the Ears of the Orthodox, who do not only think highly of him, for the Services he did in confuting the real *Antinomians*, but

also for his exemplar Piety, and in some Instances uncommon self denial. For, though they have been of Opinion, that in opposing one extream, he seemed to verge too much toward the other, and perhaps to fall in with *Amyrald*, yet they never thought that in the Doctrine of our Saviours Satisfaction, he left *Grotius* and fell in with *Episcopius* his Disciples. It lies on me therefore to produce very clear & substantial Proof to support my Charge. And that Mr. *Alsop* and his Associates may be the more fully convinced, that I am far from Tricks to force Mr. *Baxter*, to deny the Sufferings of Christ to be proper Punishments; I will make my endeavour to show, that in the controverted point about Christs Satisfaction, he forsook *Grotius* and the generality of the Reformed, asserting as his stated Judgment, ' That our Sins, were not the meritorious Cause of Christs Sufferings; That no Sufferings are properly Pænal, but what are inflicted on the Delinquent himself, that when Parents or Princes sin. and their Children or Subjects suffer, their Sufferings are but Improperly or Analogically Poenal; and that therefore Christ not being the actual Transgressor, could not be in a proper Sense punished for our Sins; That properly speaking he did not satisfy the violated Law; And agreeably adds, that the Sufferings were exacted by God, not as he was a Rector, as such, but as a Rector *supra Reges*, and as an offended Lord, and Benefactor.

And, that I may be the more clear in this attempt, I will show; how exact the Agreement between Mr. B. *Crellius*, *Episcopius*, *Curcellius* and *Limborch* is, and how full a Confutation the Answers of *Grotius* to *Socinus*, of the Bishop of Worcester unto *Crellius*, and of the Principal of *Jesus Oxon* unto the Disciples of *Episcopius*, are, of the Principles which Mr. *Baxter* has advanced.

Sub-

Subject. I.

Of the Meritorious Cause of Christs Sufferings.

1. That Mr. Baxter denies our sins to be the near impulsive, and proper meritorious Cause of Christs Sufferings.

1. It's well known to the Learned, That if Christs suffering be not *ex obligatione Legis*, and by vertue of the Sanction of the Law, sin cannot be the near impulsive, or proper meritorious Cause of them: For, as an universal and perfect Obedience to the Preceptive part of the Law, as it respects the Promissary Part, would, according to the Rules of distributive Justice, have been the meritorious Cause of the Promised reward, in like manner Sin, the transgression of the Precept, as it respects the Penal Sanction, is the meritorious Cause of the threatened Sufferings. If then I clear it, that Mr. B. is of Opinion, That Christs sufferings are not *Ex obligatione Legis*, it must be acknowledged, that he denies our sins to be their meritorious Cause, which I hope to prove, even to Mr. Alsop's Conviction, and moreover, to evince it that he doth expressly declare, that our sins were not the meritorious Cause of Christs sufferings. For,

2. Mr. B. in his sixth Determination, which is in the first Chapter of the third Part of his *Methodus*, after he had set down his Distinctions between the Law of innocent Nature, and the Law, peculiar to the Mediator; And considering the Law in the first Sense, which he saith obliged Christ himself, as Man, and all others, even sinners, he adds another Distinction between the Obligation of this Law, as a Re-

mote,

note, and as a *near Cause*, and declares his Judgment thus.

1. 'The *Law of Nature*, altho' it did *oblige* both Christ, and us unto *Obedience*, yet, it did *only oblige us*, not Christ, unto *Punishment*. The *Law obligeth* not an *innocent Person* to *Punishment*, it condemns not the *Just*.

2. 'That the *Law of Grace* obliged Christ neither to *Obedience*, nor to *Punishment*.

3. 'By the *Law*, peculiar to the *Mediator*, called the *Covenant*, between the *Father* and the *Son*, Christ was *obliged* to suffer *Punishment* for Sinners, namely, by his *Consent* and *proper Sponson*, and the *Fathers Will* and *Commandment*. From this *Law* the *near obliging Cause* of Christs suffering *Punishment* had its *Rise*.

4. 'By the *Law of Nature*, obliging us sinners unto *Punishment*, Christ was not *directly* obliged to *Punishment*; However, it was the *occasion* of his *Punishment*, and the *Obligation* we lay under was the *Remote Cause* of Christs *Obligation*, for, if the *Law* had not condemned us, Christ had never undertaken, or suffered a *vicarious Punishment*. So Mr. B.

3. From what Mr. B. has so freely declared, it's evident he is of *Opinion*, That the *Obligation* Christ lay under to suffer, ariseth not from that *Law* we violated; but from the *mediatorial Covenant*, and that the *Obligation* to *Punishment*, which is by virtue of the *Sanction* of the *Law* we violated, (under which we all are by *Nature*) is but an *occasion* or *Remote Cause*, and therefore our sins are not the *near impulsive*, and *proper meritorious Cause* of Christs sufferings, which is conform to what he has in his other *Writings*, not only in his
Post-

Posthumous Discourse of Universal Redemption, but in the Preface to his *Confession of Faith*, pag. 4. where he saith, 'That as Christ could not take upon himself the same *Numerical Guilt*, which lay on us, so neither could he take upon himself *Guilt* of the same sort, as having not the same sort of *Foundation*, or *Efficient*; Ours arising from the *Merit* of our sins, and the *Commination* of the *Law*, and his being rather occasioned, than meritted by our sin, and occasioned by the *Laws threatening* of us, both which are as we may call them, but *Pro-causes*, as to him, &c. And in his *Catho. Theol.* Part II. Pag. 78. 'Christ suffered not by that Obligation which bound us to suffer.

4. These Passages I have mentioned do sufficiently clear it, That Mr. B. owns not, that our sins were the near *impulsive*, or *meritorious Cause* of Christs Sufferings, the most he'll yield being this, viz. That our sins were the *Occasion*, or *Remote Impulsive Cause*, or the *Pro-cause*, somewhat in the place of a *meritorious Cause*, which is no more than *Socinus*, *Crellius* and their Followers do grant, as I will immediately show.

II. The *Socinians* do grant, That our sins are a *Remote Impulsive Cause*, or meer *Occasion* of Christs sufferings.

1. That the *Socinians* make so large a Concession as this unto us, is evident from most of their Writings. *Crellius* against *Grotius* confesseth it, *Fatemur, Peccata nostra, posito Dei de salute nobis danda——— decreto, eatenus etiam fuisse Impulsivam mortis Christi Causam, &c. Ad partic. 2.*

Cap. 1. But,

2. There is so much to this Purpose in the *Answer*

per the Learned Bishop of Worcester gives, to what *Crellius* has on this Point, that I will say no more of in this place, but proceed to the Proposal of what the Bishop offereth unto your Consideration.

III. What Mr. *Baxter* and the *Socinians* hold about our sins being only a *Remote Impulsive Cause*, or *Occasion* of Christs sufferings, opposed by the *Orthodox*, particularly by the Bishop of Worcester.

1. The Learned Bishop gives the Sense of the *Socinians* about the *Impulsive Cause* of Christs sufferings, assuring us, 'That tho' *Crellius* Attributes the sufferings of Christ meerly to *Acts of Dominion*, without any respect to sin, yet elsewhere he will allow a Respect, that was had to sin, antecedently to the *Sufferings of Christ*, and that the *Sins* of Men were the *Impulsive cause* of them. And although *Socinus* in one place utterly denies any *Lawful Antecedent Cause* of the *Death of Christ* besides the *Will of God and Christ*; yet *Crellius* in his *Vindication*, with, by *Lawful cause* he meant *Meritorious*; or such, upon supposition of which he ought to Die: For elsewhere, he makes *Christ* to die for the *Cause* or by the occasion of our *Sins*, which is the same, that *Crellius* means by an *Impulsive* or *Procatartick Cause*. Of Christs Suffer. Cap. 2. Sect. 2.

2. To this Notion of *Socinus* and *Crellius* the Bishop, who thoroughly search'd into this Controversy, Answers, 'That we understand not an impulsive Cause in so remote a Sense, as though our Sins were meer Occasion of Christs Dying, because the Death of Christ was one Argument; among many others to believe his Doctrine, the Belief of which would make Men leave their Sins. But we contend for a nearer and more proper Sense. But,

But, when we come to consider that other point, whether Christs Sufferings were a proper Punishment: We shall hear further what his Lordship saith to this particular. For he rightly informs us, 'That if the *Sufferings* of Christ be to be taken under the Notion of *Punishment*, then our Adversaries grant, That our Sins must be an *impulsive Cause* of them, in another Sense than they understand it. What that other Sense is, will be shown under the next Head, about *Punishment*, where you will meet with enough to satisfy you, That the *impulsive Cause*, which they'll grant on a Supposition, that Christs Sufferings are properly *Penal*, is a *near impulsive and proper meritorious Cause*.

3. Dr. Edwards doth also, in his *Preservative against Socinianism*, Part 2. p. 94. speak very distinctly to this thing. For, saith he, 'That Christ dyed for us, are the plain words of Scripture, He gave himself for us, Gal. 2. 20. Eph. 5. 25. 1 Thes. 5. 10. 2 Cor. 5. 14, 15. And this, not only in general for our good, but he was delivered up for our Offences, Rom. 4. 25. He dyed for our Sins, 1 Cor. 15. 3. So to the same purpose, and for the same Reason, he is said to dye for the Ungodly, Rom. 5. 6. And it is mentioned, as the great Instance of Gods Love to us; that whilst we were yet Sinners Christ dyed for us, ver. 10. of the same Chap. All which Phrases of dying for Sins and Sinners, plainly denote to us, that Sin in those places, is not to be considered as the *Final*, but as the *impulsive and meritorious Cause* of Christs Death.

Thus you see the Agreement between Mr. Baxter, Socinus and Crellinus about our Sins, being the *remote impulsive Cause*, or *meer occasion* of Christs Sufferings, to be real; and that he hath herein left the Orthodox,

box, such as *Grotius*, the *Bishop*, and *Dr. Edwards* is clearly proved. I will therefore consider, what is said of *Christs Sufferings* being *Penal*.

Subject II.

Of the Penalness of Christs Sufferings.

1. *Mr. Baxter* denies *Christs Sufferings* to be a proper Punishment.

1. *Mr. Baxter*, in his *Methodus*, proposeth this question. : Whether the *Passion* or *Sufferings* of *Christ*, were properly and formally a Punishment? and his *Determination* is such as clears it, that he holds *Christs Sufferings*, to be only *Improperly*, *Analogically* and *Materially*, not properly and formally a Punishment.

2. To evince thus much, I will distinctly consider what he hath premised, and show how he determines it.

1. In his *Premises*, he tells us, 'That a proper Punishment is a natural Evil, inflicted for a moral Evil. The Matter is Affliction, or a natural Evil inflicted. The Form is the Relation of this Matter to its meritorious Cause. The Fault (or moral Evil) is either really such, or by a wrong Judgment: and so Punishment is distinguished into that which is due, *ex Justitia*; or that which is undue, *ex Injustitia*: the first is a Punishment in a proper Sense; the other is a Punishment, *Analogice*, and only in the sense of a Judge, and others unjustly judging. The word [Punishment] therefore is ambiguous. Punishment in the first, and most famous Sense is a natural Evil on the Delinquent himself. Punishment, in a secondary and Analogical Sense, is a natural Evil; which doth not directly, but mediately only, and by

E

accident

* *accident* flow from a *moral Evil*. This Punishment
 ' is twofold,

' The one which *naturally* follows the Sin of ano-
 ' ther ; that is, from that *natural proximity* there is
 ' between the *Sufferer* and the *Sinner*. The other
 ' which doth not *naturally* but by a *voluntary Sponson*,
 ' so that, by *Vertue* of the *Sponson*, *vicarious Punish-*
 ' *ments* are endured.

2. The *Determination* is, 1. ' That Christ was
 ' not *re verâ* the *Sinner*, and therefore his *Sufferings*
 ' were not *Penal*, in the *Primary* and most *Famous*
 ' *Sense*.

2. ' Christ was not in the account of the Father
 ' a *Sinner*. For, God doth not judge falsely, and
 ' therefore, he did not suffer an *Analogical Punish-*
 ' *ment, ex falsa Reputazione Dei*.

3. ' Christ, being miraculously conceived by
 ' the Holy Ghost, could not suffer *Anological Punish-*
 ' *ments* for his Parents Sins.

4. Christ, being *voluntarius Pœnarum Sponson*
 ' did, as our *Sponsor*, suffer *Analogical vicarious Pun-*
 ' *ishments*. His *Sufferings* therefore, as to the *Rea-*
 ' *son* of the thing, were a *natural Evil*, endured ex
 ' *occasione, & causalitate remota Peccatorum humani*
 ' *generis & proxime*, from the *Obligation* of his proper
 ' *Sponson* and *Consent*.

3. In these *Premises*, and this *Determination*, Mr.
 Baxter freely declares, ' That our Sins were but the
 ' *occasion* or *remote*, not the near *impulsive Cause* of
 ' Christ's *Sufferings*, that his *Sufferings* were not
 ' properly and formally, but only Improperly and *Analogi-*
 ' *cally Penal*. Yea,

4. There is more in it, he is express, That a
 proper Punishment cannot be inflicted on any, but the
 Delinquent himself. For, saith he, *Pœna in sensu*
primo & famosissimo est ipsius Delinquentis malum

rale. The formal Nature of Punishment lying in Relation unto Sin as its meritorious Cause, the Punishment formally considered, cannot be thinks, on any but them, by whom the Sin is committed; and therefore agreeably enough, in pursuit of his Principle, He denies the *Sufferings of Children and Subjects* for their *Parents and Princes Sins*, to be properly and formally Penal. His distinction is between Punishment taken properly, in *Sensu primo & amosissimo*; and in an improper, secondary, and an Analogical Sense. His Determination, that Punishment in the first sense, is only on him that actually committed the Sin. That there can be no Punishment but what is deserved; and that no Man can deserve that another should be punished. That when *Parents and Princes* sin, and their *Children and Subjects* suffer, their Sufferings cannot be properly and formally Penal; because they did not commit the Sin, and so could not deserve it: Their Sufferings therefore can be but improperly and analogically Penal; as Mr. B. freely owns, when he saith, That *Pœna in sensu secundo & analogico est duplex. Altera quæ pœnam alterius naturaliter sequitur, id est, ex proximitate naturali patientis ad peccantem, & ita ob peccata minorum Pœnas consequenter patiuntur veræ* — in sensu adhuc pleniore, filius pro Parentum peccatis Pœnas; which he thinks may be called Punishment aptly enough, because they have a relation unto Sin, as to an *Occasion* or remote meritorious Cause.

2. Mr. Baxter's Agreement with Crellius, about the meritorious Cause of Christ's Sufferings, and his Sufferings being a proper Punishment.

The Sense of Crellius, being with the greatest earnestness delivered by the Bishop of W. which (saith

his Lordship,) will be best done, by laying down his principles as to the Justice of Punishments, in a more distinct Method than himself hath done: I will show the Agreement there is betwixt Mr. B. and Gressius, by proposing Gressius his Principles, in the very words of the learned Bishop; which in his *Disc. of Christs Sufferings*, Cap. 3. §. 3. you will find to be thus

1. 'That no Person can be justly punished, either for his own or anothers Fault, but he that hath deserved to be punished by some Sin of his own: For, he still asserts, That the Justice of Punishment arises from his own Fault, though the actual Punishment may be from anothers: But he that is punished without respect to his own Guilt, is punished undeservedly; and he that is punished undeservedly, is punished unjustly.

2. 'That Personal Guilt being supposed, one Mans Sin may be the impulsive Cause of anothers Punishment, but they cannot be the meritorious. The difference between them he thus explains, the Cause is that which makes a thing to be; The impulsive is that which moves one to do a thing without any Consideration of Right that one hath to do it; Merit, is that which makes a Man worthy of a thing either good or bad, and so gives a right to it: if it be good to himself. if bad to him at whose hands he hath deserved it. Now he tells us, that it is impossible, That one Mans Sins should make any other deserve Punishment, but the Person who committed them; but they may impel one to punish another, and that justly, if the Person hath otherwise deserved to be punished, unjustly, if he hath not. The Reason he gives of it is, That the violence of the Act, which is the proper Cause of Punishment, cannot go beyond the Person of the Offender; and therefore can oblige none

his to Punishment, but him that hath committed the
 n a Fault. And therefore he asserts, That no Man
 will can be punished beyond the desert of his own Sins, but
 and there may be sometimes a double impulsive Cause
 the of that Punishment, viz. his own and other Mens,
 his whereof one made, that they should be justly punished,
 will the other that they should be actually. But the lat-
 her, he saith, always supposeth the former, as the
 her foundation of just Punishment, so that no part of Pun-
 de- ishment, could be executed upon him, wherein his own
 for, sins were not supposed, as the meritorious Cause of it.
 ari- Here then you may see, with what clearness the
 ish- bishop hath stated the Principles of *Crellius*, and if
 shed you'll compare them with what I have taken out of
 er- Mr. *Baxter's Methodus*, you'll find the Agreement
 un- to be in the following Instances.

1. That a proper Punishment cannot be inflicted,
 ans any but him that committed the Sin. There
 ish- can be here no difference between them, unless in
 The- is, that *Crellius* grants more, and, if I mistake not
 cause- some nearer to the Orthodox than either Mr. B.
 ve- or Mr. W. do, when he owns,

any 1. ' That a remote Conjunction, may be suffi-
 Me- cient for a Translation of Penalty, viz. from one
 ei- Generation to another.

be 2. ' That Sins may be truly said, to be punished
 ath- in others, when the Offenders themselves may es-
 le- scape Punishment. Thus the Sins of Parents in
 un- their Children, and Princes in their Subjects.

hey 3. ' That an Act of Dominion in some, may be
 the- designed as a proper Punishment to others.

st- 4. ' That the Nature of Punishment is not to be
 is- measured by the Sense of it.

per When I observe, with what indignation Mr. B.
 er- expresseth himself against our Suffering, or being
 ne- punished in Christ; I cannot but conclude, that here-
 to

in *Crellius* yields more to the *Orthodox* than Mr. B. doth, who, I believe, being aware that such learned Men as the Bishop of *W.* would make too great an Improvement of such *Concessions*, he would not give the Advantage. For indeed, the Bishop hath well improved what *Crellius* grants; as is plain from what he saith, in *Cap. 3. §. 2.* Now upon these *Concessions*, though our Adversaries will not grant, 'That Christ was properly punished for our Sins; yet they cannot deny, but that we may very properly be said, to be punished for our Sins in Christ; and if they will yield us this, the other may be a Strife about words. For, surely there may be easily imagined, as great a Conjunction between Christ and us, as between the several Generations of the Jews, and that last which was punished in the Destruction of *Hierusalem*: And though we escape that Punishment which Christ did undergo, yet we might have our Sins punished in him, as well as Princes theirs, in their Subjects, when they escape themselves, &c.

What I have suggested on this Occasion, clears it, that Mr. B. differs at least as much if not more from the *Orthodox*, than *Crellius* and his Admirers do.

2. They also agree, in holding; That the Sufferings of Children or Subjects, when their Parents or Princes Sin, are not proper Punishments, either on the Children or Subjects, and that Christs Sufferings because he was not the Sinner, were not properly Penal.

The Opposition made by the Bishop of *Worcester* and the *Principal* of *Jesus, Oxon*, against the Principles, embraced by Mr. *Baxter* and *Crellius*.

I. The

1. The Bishop having given a clear state of the principles of *Crellius* in this matter, as I have already shown, adds, 'These are his [*viz. Crellius*] two main Principles, which we must now thoroughly examine, the main force of his Book lying in them. But if we can prove, that it hath been generally received by the Consent of Mankind, that a Person may be punished beyond the desert of his own Actions; if God hath justly punished some for the Sins of others, and there be no Injustice in one Mans Suffering by his own Consent for another, then these Principles of *Crellius*, will be found not so firm as he imagins them.

1. 'That it hath been generally received, by the Consent of Mankind, That a Person may be justly punished beyond the Desert of his own Actions. For which Purpose, *Grotius* objected against *Socinus* (who appealed to the Consent of Nations, about one being punished for anothers Fault) that the Heathens did agree, That Children might be punished for their Parents Faults, and People for their Princes; and that corporal Punishment might be born, by one for another; did appear by the Persians punishing the whole Family for the Fault of one. — In which Cases, (saith the Bishop) The Punishment did extend beyond the Desert of the Person, who suffered it; for no other Reason is assigned of these Sufferings, besides the Conjunction of the Person or his Consent; but no antecedent Guilt is supposed as necessary to make the Punishment Just. — If it be said that the injustice lies in this; that such a one suffers undeservedly, and therefore unjustly; I answer; If it be meant by undeservedly, without sufficient Cause or Reason of Punishment, then we deny, that such a one doth suffer undeservedly. *Immerito* in the Greek Glosses is rendred by Ἀλόως and *merito* by — εὐλόως,

and in *Cicero*, *Jure*, & *merito* are most commonly joyned together. So that where there is a Right to punish, and sufficient reason for it, such a one doth not suffer *Immerito* (i. e.) *undeservedly*. If it be said, *That such a one is not dignus poena*, that implies no more than the other; for *Dignus*, or as the Antients writ it *Dicnus*, comes from the Greek *ἴσταν*, *ἴστω*, as *Vossius* tells us, *ut dignus sit cui tribui aliquid aequum est*: So that where there is an equity in the thing, there is a *Dignity* in the Person, or he may be said to be *worthy to undergo it*. So far the Bishop, who hath cleared it beyond contradiction, that one may endure a proper Punishment for the sins of another, and that thus it is in the case of Childrens and Peoples sufferings for their Parents and Princes sins.

2. The confining a proper and just Punishment to the Person that commits the sin, denying the sufferings of one for the sin of another to be properly *penal*, doth at once subvert both the Doctrines of our Saviour's Satisfaction and Original Sin. For, if a Man may not be justly punished beyond the *Desert* of his own Acts, the Lord Jesus, who never committed sin, could not bear a proper Punishment, nor could any of *Adam's* Posterity be justly punished for his sin. In answer hereunto I will give you the sense of the Learned Dr. *Edwards*, who expresseth himself in these words; 'Now I say, there hath not been (for ought I know) any Nation, or Kingdom in the World, that hath not in some cases, and for some weighty Reasons, thought, and adjudged it lawful to punish one man for the sins of another. So that over-hastily, and peremptorily; (as the Socinians, and Remonstrants do) to pronounce the Imputation of *Adam's* sin, and the punishing of his Posterity for it *Unlawfully*, barely for this Reason, that no man can be justly punished, who was not a Party,

Party, and actually engaged in the practice of the sin, is to contradict the *Reason*, and condemn the *Usage* of all Mankind: and not only so, but as this Position is roundly, and without exception laid down by them, it tends plainly to overthrow the whole *Design* of the Gospel, by denying the sufferings of Christ to have the true Notion of a *Punishment*, whereby he satisfied the Justice of God for the *sins* of Mankind.

‘ In short ; The present matter in debate between us, and our Adversaries, turns upon this point, *whether in any case, a person may lawfully, and justly be punished for a Crime, which he did not personally commit?* They deny it, and condemn the practice as absolutely unlawful: We, on the other hand say, This may be justly done, and for a proof of the Legality of it, we can produce the consent of all the most Civiliz’d *States* and Governments that have been in the World, who have accounted it in some cases *Lawful*, and those especially two. 1. Where there hath been the voluntary Offer, and Consent of the Party, as in the case of *Sureties, Hostages, &c.* Or, 2. Without that Consent, where there is either a *Natural*, or *Civil*, and *Political* Union between the Persons offending, and the Persons punished ; such as is that between a King and his Subjects, Parents and Children. And here we have, which is a consideration of much greater weight, the particular Direction, and Example of God himself, to justify and warrant this practice. *Saul slew the Gibeonites*, and the Sons and Grand-children are executed for it, *2 Sam. 21.* *David* sinneth in numbring the People, and God sent a Pestilence among his Subjects— *2 Sam. 24.* This and much more is in *Dr. Edwards*, his *Preservat. part. 2. p. 50, 51, &c.* making it very clear, That one

one may be *properly* punished for anothers sin. And that thus it is in the case of Christs suffering for us, and of Childrens and Subjects suffering for the sins of their Parents, and their Kings.

3. What I have cited out of the writings of these great Men, makes it very clear, That Mr. *Baxter's* denying our Sin to be the proper meritorious Cause of Christs Sufferings, and his Sufferings to be a proper Punishment; is a manifest contradicting the Body of Protestant Writers on these Points, as an opposition to the allowed Custom of Mankind, and the plainest Texts of Scripture. And his affirming that a proper Punishment, cannot be justly inflicted on any but him who committed the Sin; and that when they, who by their own Actions have not deserved a Punishment do suffer, their Sufferings are no otherwise Penal than *materially, improperly and analogically*, he agrees with *Socinus, Crellius, Episcopius* and his Disciples is most evident; and what the learned *Bishop* and *Principal* have insisted on, in their answer unto our *Socinian* and *Episcopian* Adversaries, is a most direct and exact Confutation of Mr. *Baxter*.

4. These things are so plain, that I doubt not of the concurrence of an impartial learned Reader. However for the sake of Mr. *Alsop*, and others less studied or prejudiced Divines, I will offer sundry other Considerations for the fuller Proof, that Mr. *Baxter* differs from his Orthodox Brethren, and falls in with *Episcopius* and his Disciples in the Doctrine of our Saviours Satisfaction.

Subject. 4.

Further Proof that Mr. B. hath left the common Doctrine of Protestants in the Article of Christs Satisfaction.

Consi-

Consideration I.

1. It must be acknowledged, That if Christs Sufferings were *properly* Penal, they would so far have answered the Obligations of the violated Law, that it might be said, *properly speaking, Christ satisfied the Law it self.* On the other hand, in case it shall appear, that Mr. B. denies Christs satisfying the Law it self in a proper Sense, it must be yielded, that he denyeth *Christs Sufferings* to be a *proper Punishment.* The Connection that there is between the one and the other, makes good what I herein affirm, and whoever will search closely into this Controversie, will find, That the true Reason, why Christs satisfying the Law in a *proper Sense* is denied, is because Satisfaction cannot in this Sense, be made to the Law any otherwise than by Christs enduring a proper Punishment. To satisfy the Law it self, is to *answer the Obligation* of the Law, and suffer by Vertue of its Sanction, and nothing more evident, than that Sufferings by Vertue of its Sanction, are a proper Punishment. But,

2. Mr. B. is as expresse in denying Christs *satisfying* the Law, as he is in denying his Sufferings to be a proper Punishment. This Charge hath so much Reason for its support, that whoever will consult his *Methodus*, p. 3. cap. I. Determ. 2. will see enough to convince him, there he will meet with this Question, 'Whether it may be *properly* said, that Christ satisfied the Law it self, as it obliged Sinners to Punishment, to which he adds in a Parenthesis (*etiam si eam non patiendo implevit?*) or rather ought we not to say, That Christ satisfied not the Law, but the Lawgiver, as above his Laws?

3. That we may with the more distinction, take in his genuine Sense, it must be noted. 1. That Mr.

Mr. B. is of opinion, there was a dispensing with the Law, not only as to the Person suffering, but as to the Penalty suffered; that the Sufferings of our Saviour were not by Vertue of the Penal Sanction of the Law, and therefore could be in no sense a fulfilling that part of the Law.

2. That he considereth not God in exacting Satisfaction, as a *Rector qua talis*, whose part it is to see, that the Law be satisfied, but as a *Rector qua supra Leges*, and God considered as such may be satisfied, although no proper Punishment be indured.

3. Thus much premised, we shall find, that he uses the word [*Satisfaction*] in a very large and comprehensive sense, for whatever answers some remote ends of the Law. The Sanction of the Law is essential to it, and cannot be satisfied but by sufferings that are properly a Punishment. But such ends of the Law as are not essential thereunto, and only remote, may be obtained without bearing the Punishment, or indeed without enduring any Sufferings at all.

4. That Mr. B. aims at no more by his Notion of Christs Satisfaction, than an obtaining some remote ends of the Law; is manifest from the very passage my Friend tells me, Mr. Aliop refers unto, to prove my Charge to be notoriously false; and a careful observing its genuine Import, which will be very plain if we consult that entire Paragraph, may convince an impartial Mind; That Mr. B. hath different Apprehensions in these Points, from his Orthodox Brethren: For, such he, *Locutione remota, & lata Christus dici poss.*, *Legis fines remotas, ipsi non essentielles, obtinend.*, *et satisfecisse*: In a remote, large Sense, Christ may be said to satisfy the Law. But how? not by obtaining any End essential to the Law, but the remote Ends of the Law; for its immediately

with added, ' That Gods hatred of Sin and his Justice are no less demonstrated by Christs Satisfaction, at least in a manner no less congruous for obtaining all the ends of Government, than if the Sinners themselves had been damned. If we compare this clause of the Paragraph with the foregoing part; we shall find, that what he saith, of [all the Ends of Government] must be understood, as he expresses it of [all the remote ends of the Law,] which are not essential to the Law, and may in Mr. Baxters opinion, be obtained without Christs bearing a proper Punishment, the true evincement of Gods hatred to Sin.

5. That I take Mr. B. right will further appear, by considering the Paragraph next after this, where he distinguisheth between the Near and the Remote Ends of the Law, affirming, ' That the *Finis proximus*, which doth enjoyne Obedience, and threatens a punishment for Disobedience, is a part of the Law, and it must not be said that Christ did properly satisfy this End. But there is the Remote End of the Law, namely, the prevention of sin, the exercise, and preservation of Humane Righteousness, and demonstration of Divine Justice, which is not the Law it self, altho' it's so termed by the Jurists, because these Ends may be obtained by other Means than by Punishing. So that it's manifest, he holds, that these Ends might be obtained by the Lord Jesus, tho' he never bore the punishment of our sins. The Satisfaction then that Mr. B. is for, is of another nature, than what is embraced by the Reformed; It is what's done without Christs suffering a proper Punishment, and without a proper satisfying of the Law; For, saith he, properly speaking, Christ did not Satisfie the Law it self, nor did he properly satisfy the Near End of the Law, viz. the penal part. N. et. p. 3. c. 1. p. 47.

A Second Consideration.

2. The very Notion *Mr. B.* hath of Christ's Satisfaction is, not only different from what is embraced by the *Orthodox*, but such as is so far from comprizing within its compass Christ's suffering a proper Punishment, as to exclude it: It is what can be made without the Lord Christ's taking on him the *Guilt* of our sins; and what is inconsistent with Christ's making a proper Satisfaction to the Law.

1. Thus much he endeavours to prove from the definition he gives of Satisfaction, which is thus, *Satisfactio strictè sumpta, est Redditio Equivalentis indebiti pro ipso debito; vel tantundem pro eodem*, and by *Indebitum*, he means somewhat of a distinct nature from what the Law exacts; somewhat that is not properly *Pœnal*, and consorantly by the *Equivalent*, or *Tantundem*, he intends what is very different from what is Received and Believed by the Reformed. For, whereas the *Equivalent*, in their Judgment, respects the Punishment we deserved, and in those instances in which it's not the same, it doth in its *Valuation* bear a just proportion thereunto; His *Equivalent* doth not respect the Sufferings we deserved, but the Remote Ends of the Law, and as it's adjusted to those Ends, tho' there be nothing of the Nature of Punishment in it, yet is it an *Equivalent*.

2. That this is his sense of an *Equivalent*, is manifest from his asserting, that *Qui fines Legis Remotos alio modo quam Puniendo obtinet, Tantundem præstare putatur, ac si Peccatorem Punivisset; ubi sup. p. 47.* This account *Mr. B.* gives of Satisfaction, is in the first Argument, he urgeth to prove, that properly speaking, Christ did not satisfy the Law it self. What is, (saith he) impossible, Christ did not do; but to satisfy the Law, strictly speaking, is impossible. The *Minor* he thus proves; *Satisfactio strictè sumpta est Redditio*

Redditio Equivalentis indebiti, pro ipso debito ; At impossibile est ipsam eandem Legem (de qua loquimur) commutare idem pro equivalente. This is his Argument, in which lieth the main stress of his Cause, which methinks may be soon enervated, if we consider, as indeed we must, that the Poenal Sanction of the Law is not Abrogated ; that it is only Relaxed ; that the Relaxation is not of the *Formal Nature* of the Poenalty suffered, but doth respect the *Person* suffering ; and that tho' the Relaxing be an act of Dominion, yet God exacts and receives satisfaction, as a *Rector quæ talis*, and not as a *Rector supra Leges*.

3. The Learned Bishop of Worcester against Crellius, cap. 4. § 5. hath with great clearness shown, in what respects the Sufferings of Christ were the same with what we deserved, & in what Instances not. That they were so far the same as to be a proper Punishment : and in those circumstances, wherein there was a difference, there was an *Equivalent*. 'No more is necessary (saith his Lordship) to the delivery of another Person, than the satisfying the Ends of the Law, and Government. And, if that may be done by an *Equivalent Suffering*, tho' not the same in all respects, then it may be a proper *Surrogation*. If David had obtained his wish, that he had Died for his Son Absalom, it had not been necessary in order to his Sons escape, that he had hanged by the hair of the head, as his Son did. And therefore, when the Lawyers say, *Subrogatum sapit Naturam ejus in cujus locum subrogatur* : Covarruvias tells us, it is to be understood *secundum Primordialem Naturam, non secundum Accidentalem* ; from whence it appears that all Circumstances are not necessary to be the same in *Surrogation*, but that the Nature of the Punishment remain the same. But,

4. Mr. B. hath not in his *Equivalent*, so much as the *Formal Nature* of Punishment, nor are his *Equivalent*

valent Sufferings of Christ satisfactory, as they respect the *Proxime End* of the Law, to wit, the *Commination*, or *Sanction*; but as they are adjusted to obtain such other Ends of the Law as are not *Essential* to the Law: and herein also lieth the *Principal Reason* of Christ's Satisfaction, according to the Notion he hath framed of it. Thus in one place (*viz. p. 53.*) he saith; ' And because the reason of Satisfaction, lieth ' in its being the Payment of an *Equivalent*, instead ' of the *Debt it self*; and the *Equivalent* consists in ' its *Aptitude* to obtain the same Ends of Govern- ' ment, and because *One End* of Government is the ' demonstration of *God's Punishing Justice*, and ano- ' ther End the demonstration of *God's Sanctity* and ' Love, and the vindication of the Honour of his ' Law; and because God doth no less effectually ' show his Punishing Justice in the *Punishment* of ' Christ, than if he had *destroyed the World*, and also ' hath no less evidently shown his *Sanctity*, his *Love* ' of *Goodness*, and the *Equity* and *Perfection* of his *Law* ' by the *Perfect Holiness* and *Obedience* of *Christ*, ' than if we our selves had *perfectly* obeyed it, it fol- ' lows, that the *punishment of Christ is satisfaction*, and ' the *Meritorious Goodness of Christ is satisfaction*, but ' not in the same sense with the *former*. Thus he, who indeed speaks of *Punishing Justice*, which cannot be meant in any other sense than *that*, in which he takes *Punishment* it self, in this Controversie. I doubt not but that he was of Opinion, that by *Extrinssecal Denomination*, *God's Justice* may by us, through our weakness, be distinguished according to its respect to diversity of Objects, by *inadaequate conceptions*; and that the *Punishing Justice*, he speakss of, in this place, connoting only an improper Punishment, is from that connotation, by him denominated *Punishing Justice* in as improper a sense, as he takes the Punishment it self to be.

5. That I have not misrepresented *Mr. B.* in the account I have given of his Notion about *Punishing Justice*, is evident to me from the following considerations.

1. *Punitive Justice*, as it imports a Perfection, Natural in God, discovers it self by inflicting proper Punishments on Offenders. The Sufferings that are but *materially, improperly, and analogically* poenal, call'd by *Mr. Baxter* as well as by *Limborch*, *Vicarious Punishments*, that is, Sufferings, which, tho' they are not themselves Punishments, are nevertheless in their place and stead, flow not from *Punitive Justice*, taken properly, and are not Effects, or discoveries of it, but most they are and can be Acts only of Dominion. And that we might not mistake *Mr. Baxter*, when he mentions the *Demonstration* of God's *Punishing Justice*, as if he had taken it in the same sense the Orthodox use the words, he closes the Paragraph, in which they lye thus; *Sed breviter, & Simpliciter dicendum est, Deum peccata, & pœnas nobis remittere, via Christus hoc Meruit, & perfectione habituali, & actuali, & Pœnas vicarias subeundo.* Thus you see, he reduceth all he had said before to the Merit of Christ's *Habitual* and *Actual* Perfections, and to his Suffering *Vicarious Punishments*, that is, *material, improper and analogical* Punishments, instead of such as are *properly poenal*; and therefore by *Punitive Justice*, he cannot mean what the Orthodox do.

2. The reducing all to Merit doth further confirm my sense of *Mr. B.* who in 'this very page' assueth us, 'That the Mediator could not procure our Justification, and Salvation any otherwise than by way of Merit, and because nothing can more effectually Merit from the most Holy God, than that which doth mostly Please Him, and nothing more

F

Pleasing

Pleasing to him than *Goodness, Holiness, Love, and Justice*, it follows that Christ could not more effectually *Merit* our Justification and Salvation, than by *Goodness, Holiness, Love, Justice and Obedience*; and, by this method turning a proper *Punishment* into *meer Sufferings*, (which, as divested of their *Penal Nature*, can no otherwise fall under the consideration of a Law, but as enjoined by a *Precept*, which, he saith, belongs to the *Mediatorial Law*;) these *Sufferings* also are made to be but *Acts of Obedience*, and, in conjunction with other *Mediatorial Acts* of the same nature, are affirm'd to be *Meritorious*; and this *Merit* resolved, in its *Last Result*, into *Divine Pleasure*; I say, in the *Last Result*, because, he doth not only assign unto the *Divine Pleasure*, the admission of another on our behalf; but will have it, that the *Merit* it self is of that kind, which is no further *Meritorious* than as it doth, and only as it doth *satisfie* the *Divine Pleasure*, for as it is *Pleasing*, so it *merits*, and proportionably as it is *most Pleasing*, so it's *most meritorious*; whereby *Distributive Justice* altogether, as well as *Punitive*, (which is but one Branch of it) is excluded from having any *Glory* upon the account of what Christ did and suffered, the whole of the *Merit* being from *Divine Grace, and Acceptation*: So far is *Mr. B.* from owning, that *Punitive Justice*, taken properly is *satisfied* by the sufferings of Christ. Besides,

3. *Mr. Baxter* insisting so very much on *Satisfaction*, as its *Principal Reason* lieth in its aptitude to obtain the *Remote Ends* of the Law, leaves no room for doubt concerning his sense in this matter. For seeing the *Formal Reason* of *Satisfaction*, lyeth in the Aptitude of what Christ did or suffered, to obtain some *Remote Ends*, which, of what nature soever, so long as they are *Remote* from the *Sanction*, they cannot

cannot be *satisfactory* in the sense embraced by the Reformed, and the sufferings themselves can be no otherwise a satisfaction, than any other *eximious* work may be: and any other excellent work done by him, may be as truly satisfactory, as his sufferings; a Notion which he freely acknowledgeth, p 55. where he saith, *Rektor, quæ supra Leges, satisfactionem recipere potest, etiam per opus aliquod præstantissimum.*

A third Consideration.

3. That Mr. B. denies Christs *Sufferings* to be properly *Penal*, is further evident from his holding, that Christs *Satisfaction* is not made to God as a *Rektor quæ talis*, but to him as he is a *pars offensa*; an injured Lord and Benefactor.

1. The learned *Grotius*, in the account he gives of the *αποστολὴ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, the Principal and Foundation Error, that runs through the Socinian Scheme, saith, That it lies in their considering God in this great Transaction, as a *pars offensa*, a Creditor, a Lord, or Sovereign; and in Oppolition unto them, he proves, That to punish is not an *Act* competent to an offended Party, as such; that naturally the *Pars offensa*, as such, hath no right in Punishment. That to inflict Punishment belongs *primo & per se* to a *Rektor*, as such; and that this right in the *Rektor*, is not a right of *absolute Dominion* or of *Credit*; That God in exacting *Satisfaction*, is to be considered only as a *Rektor*, whence it is, that the *Sufferings* Christ endured when he made *Satisfaction*, must be owned to be an *Act of Justice*, and properly *Penal*.

2. Mr. Baxter on the other hand, is as express, That God is not to be considered only as a *Rektor quæ talis* but as a *Rektor supra Leges*, as a *Pars offensa*, and as an injured Lord and Benefactor; that properly speaking, we must not say; That Christ satisfied the

Legislator, *qua talis tantum*, but the Reſtor, *qua ſupra Leges*. That although God conſidered only *as a Reſtor exactis Punishments formally, as ſuch*, yet God requires them *qua Satisfactory*, not only *as a Reſtor*, but *as a Lord and Benefactor*, vindicating his own Glory, ſee *Metb. Part 3. p. 47, 51, 55.*

3. The learned Mr. B. being ſo full in the declaration of his Mind in this Point, and over and over averring, that *Deum Satisfactionem recepiffe, non tantum qua Judicem, ſed etiam, qua Dominum & Benefactorem offenſum*; we have the greateſt reaſon to conclude, that the Satisfaction he is for, cannot (as Grotius well obſerves) be at all unto God as a *Reſtor qua talis*. *Non poteſt enim idem duobus diverſis tribui qua talibus*; nor can it include any thing within its compaſs, that is, properly Penal, ſo long as the Act of puniſhing doth not belong only to a *Reſtor as ſuch*.

4. That I take Mr. B. right, appears to me very manifeſt, from what he hath in the firſt Part of his *Methodus cap. 15.* where he ſaith, ' That after Grotius his Book *de Satisfactione* had been publiſhed, 'twas made a Queſtion, Whether God puniſheth Sinners either as an *absolute Lord and Sovereign*, or as *pars offenſa*; or only as a *Reſtor ſecundum Leges*? To which he diſtinctly answers in theſe words, paſſing by the Opinions of others. The Truth is, 1. ' No Sins do really hurt God. However, 2. They are *injurious* to God. 3. There is a *threefold Right* of God, *quantum in ſe*, ſtruck at. 1. ' A Right of *Dominion* by alienating and denying his own *quoad uſum*. 2. A Right of *Empire* by Rebellion, and a denial of that Obedience which is due unto him. 3. The *Right of Friendſhip* by withholding their Love, and by an ungrateful abuſe of his Benefits. 4. Theſe *violated Rights*, God may vindicate in each of theſe *Relations*. 5. God therefore is

is an *Actor*, not only as he is a *Rector*, but as he is a *pars offensa*, although not *realiter* *Lasa*. 6. Thus much appears with the greatest clearness, because, although the *publick Good* is the end of *humane Regiment*, yet the *Glory of God himself*, his *Complacency* or *Pleasure*, is the end of *Divine Government* and of every thing besides. But, 7. To *Judge formally*, belongs to a *Rector as such*, and not to a *Lord* or *Benefactor* as such. 8. However, when God judgeth he doth not divest himself of the *Relations* of a *Lord* and *Benefactor*; but these *Relations* are to be considered, as connoted and inseparable in a *Judge*. 9. When God is called *pars offensa*, we do not mean *pars equalis*, or one offended against that *Justice*, which is meerly *commutative*: But we intend no more than the *supreme Lord* of all, the *Rector* and *Benefactor* is offended by them who are *his own*, his *Subjects*, but *disobedient* and *ungrateful*, *Isa*. 1. 2, 3, 4. *Ezek*. 18. 4. God therefore doth *exact Punishment* not only for conserving the *order* and *good* of the *World*; but also *finally* for his own *Glory*, to demonstrate his *Holiness* and *Justice*. Because his *Glory* is the *end* of his *Government*, God therefore doth *exact Punishments*, not only as a *Rector* but as an *injured Lord* and *Benefactor*. And although he judgeth *formally*, as a *Rector secundum Leges*, *prout a se datas*, yet as connoting his other *Relations*, that is, as a *Rector* who is an *offended Lord* and *Father*. So far *Mr. Baxter*, who scruples not to declare, that God in requiring *Satisfaction*, is not to be considered only as a *Rector secundum Leges*, as such, but as an *injured Sovereign* and *Benefactor*, and as a *Rector supra Leges*, whence it must be acknowledged, that *Christs Sufferings* could not be properly *Pænal*. That they are no other than what are exacted by an *injured Lord* and *Benefactor*, or as a *Rector supra Leges*, who,

as such, exacts not Punishment, formally as such; and that therefore the punishment can be but *improper* and *analogical*, as he explains it, p. 341. where he freely declares, 'That altho' Punishment, strictly taken, is only the Effect of a *Rector*, yet a *Friend*, or *Benefactor*, wearied with Ingratitude, may Execute *Analogical Punishments*. Thus, for a *Friend*, not to love, A *Benefactor*, ceasing to bestow his Favours; a *Father*, with-holding the *Effects* and *Tokens* of his *Paternal Affections*; are their ways of Punishment. And because God's *Kingdom* is *Paternal*, where all that the Subjects enjoy belong to the *Ruler*, and where *Love* bears *Dominion* in the Government, the with-holding *Divine Benefits*, is not in a *forced*, or *improper*, but in a most eminent sense called *Divine Punishing*.

5. This passage of Mr. Baxter doth fully clear it, that in his Opinion Christ's Sufferings are not *proper Punishments*. And tho, in condescension to the weak, he yielded so far as to accommodate his way of writing to them, who differed from him, using sundry *Terms* and *Phrases*, which the Orthodox have chosen and established as explicating the Truth most distinctly, and with the greatest plainness, yet did he openly oppose the use of other *Terms* and *Phrases*, such as *Christ's Sufferings*, and *Dying in the Person of Sinners*, &c. and took particular care to discover his true meaning; that we might not think he did take even those he used, in the same sense, in which they are used by the Orthodox. For, it appeareth very convincingly to me, it is his stated Judgment, that God exacts *formal* and *proper Punishment* only as a *Rector qualis*; and as an *Injured Lord* and *Benefactor*, he executes *Analogical Punishment*; and that when God,

as a *Benefactor*, with-holds his Benefits, he may be said to *punish*, and so far, and in what sense he may be said to *punish*, he may be said to glorify his *Punishing Justice*; but not as an *Injured Lord* and *Benefactor*. And he not exacting Punishments taken properly and formally, the *punishing Justice* Mr. Baxter speaks of, is not taken in a proper sense; for Punishing Justice thus taken, belongs only to a *Rector, quæ talis*.

These Considerations may suffice to vindicate my Charge, [That Mr. Baxter denieth Christ's Sufferings to be a proper Punishment] from the Ignorant and Rude Assaults of my Adversary; who, if he had kept more closely to his Studies, and minded Things more than *Indecent Words*, could never have been imposed upon, as in this Point he has been. And certain I am, that if the *Learned* and plain-hearted Mr. Baxter had been alive, he would thank neither Mr. Williams, nor Mr. Allop for their Attempts to conceal his true sense of these Points from the World.

Before I close this Discourse, I will set down a summary of Mr. Baxter's Belief in these matters, particularly, 'That Christ's sufferings were not *ex Obligatione Legis*; That our sins were not the near impulsive, or proper meritorious cause of his sufferings; That his sufferings were not properly and formally pœnal; That no sufferings are properly punishments, but what are inflicted on the Delinquent himself; That when Parents sin, and their Children suffer, their sufferings are not properly and formally, but materially, improperly and analogically pœnal; That Christ, (properly speaking) did not satisfy the Law, nor God, as a *Rector, quæ talis* only, but as a *Rector supra Leges*, as a *pars offensa*, as an *Injured Lord* and *Benefactor*; That a

' proper strict Satisfaction is the solution, or pay-
 ' ment of an *Æquivalent*, which *was not due* for
 ' what was due ; That the *Æquivalence* lyeth in an
 ' aptitude to answer the Remote Ends of the Law ;
 ' That an answering the *Remote Ends* of the Law,
 ' is of a distinct nature from answering its Obl-
 ' gations or *Pœnal Sanction* ; That the Obligation
 ' Christ lay under to suffer, arose only from the
 ' *Mediatorial Præcept*, and Christ's voluntary Spon-
 ' sion ; That what answers only the Præcept of a
 ' Law, and is only an *Act of Obedience*, cannot,
 ' considered *as such*, be a punishment ; That the
 ' true Reason, why Christ's sufferings are said to
 ' be pœnal, is because of their *matter*, which is
 ' painful and dolorous ; That the Justice of God,
 ' which Christ satisfied, tho' called *punitive*, yet
 ' must not be understood in a *strict sense*, for that
 ' *punishing Justice*, from whence a proper punishment
 ' doth flow ; That Christ's entire Righteousness
 ' was his performance of the Condition of his
 ' Covenant with the Father ; and his performance
 ' of that Condition was his *meritorious Title to God's*
 ' *promised Effects* ; That tho' the *matter* of the Cove-
 ' nant of Works was taken into the Mediatorial
 ' Law, yet Christ was never under the *Formal*
 ' *Obligation* of the Law of Works, nor did he
 ' *strictly merit* according to its Rule.

This is an impartial Account of Mr. *Baxter's*
 Sentiments touching the Nature of Christ's *Satis-*
faction and *Merit* ; and, as this Notion is distinct
 from what is embraced by the *Reformed*, so, whilst
 he uses the same *Terms* the Orthodox do, yet it
 is in a *different sense*. For by the words [*Punish-*
ment, Punishing Justice, Christ's Righteousness and
Merit, yea and proper Satisfaction] he doth (as I
 have already suggested) intend quite another
 thing

thing than the Protestants do: And, because these Terms and Phrases are not in Scripture, he is not for an insisting on their use against the Socinians. *De Nomine* [*vid. Satisfactionis*] *non multum Litigandum est: & siqui Sociniani, aut alii Satisfactionis nomen, quia in Sacris Literis non reperitur, repudiant necessitatem Nominis, non asserere debemus: Meth. Theol. part. 3. cap. 1. Diterm. 12. p. 49.*

But, in opposition hereunto, the Learned Dr. Edwards expresseth himself thus: 'The words [*vid. Satisfaction and Merit*] are now adopted by the Church, inserted into her *Homilies* and *Liturgies*, they are part of the *Catholick Faith*, and become the *Common Language* of all Christians. So that we cannot lay them aside, without giving infinite offence, and scandal to all our Friends of the Reformation, and at the same time of affording matter of *Boasting* and *Triumph* to our Adversaries of the Church of Rome; who have long since told the World, that we are grown weary of our Old Religion, and are all ready to turn Socinians. Besides all this, it will justify in great measure the Calumnies of our Modern Unitarians who will exceedingly triumph to find their suspicion made good, *viz.* that we secretly favour their Impious Opinions: and that if it were not for the *Bias*, that is given to our minds by the *Awe* of our Superiours, and the *Love* of our Preferments, we would soon take off the Mask, and discover our True Sentiments in their favour. *Preservat. against Socin. Part. 3. p. 110.*

What this Learned Person offers against the very Notion of Mr. Baxter, as well as of Curcellanus and Limborch, I do humbly recommend to the consideration not only of Mr. Alsop, but of all the
Brethren

Brethren at *Little St. Hellens*, and do wish with all my heart, that Mr. *Alfop* may be enabled to weigh with deliberation and soberness, whether there be the least Reason for his declaring so positively, *That neither Mr. Williams, nor Mr. Baxter deny Christ's Sufferings to be proper punishments?* or what pleasure it can afford him, on a Dying Bed, to consider what countenance he has given to the very Notions he now would be thought to abhor? How he hath discouraged, yea reviled them, who appear in the Defence of those Truths, which so nearly affect our Salvation? And how much he hath strengthened the hands of them, who hold such Opinions as open a Door for the letting in the very Abominations we are at this time in most danger of: For, the very Engine chosen by the *Socinian Combinators* in the year 1546. as most likely to introduce their Impious Heresies, was their corrupting the Doctrine of our Blessed Saviour's Satisfaction. As *Wissowatius*, in his *Compendious Narration*, in the mention he makes of the *Italian Combinators*, tells us, it was to bring the Received Opinion of the Trinity into doubt; so *Sandius* in his *Anti-Trinitarian Bibliothec.* p. 18. speaking of their Colledges and Conferences, adds, *in quibus potissimum Dogmata vulgaria de Trinitate, ac Christi Satisfactione, hisq; similia in Dubium revocabant;* And what is remarkable, *Lubieniecus*, in his History of the *Polonian Reformation*, lib. 2. c. 1. ingenuously confesseth, that 'twas also their care to insinuate, that in the Article of Justification, an applying the Merit of Christ unto us by Faith alone, was one of those Opinions, introduced by the *Greek Philosophers*.

Of these things I take the more notice, because at this time, as Mr. *Williams* doth, not only corrupt

rupt the Doctrine of *Christ's Satisfaction*, but that other of *Justification*; in like manner, He doth as these *Socinians* did, subscribe with a distinction, securing his own sense, and carries it so subdously, as to influence some worthy Divines, who are sound in the Faith, to give too much Reputation unto him, and consequently to his Erroneous Opinions. I can hardly forbear the mention of an Aged Divine, who hath been Mr. *Williams* his Tool to the hindring a Re-Union; but at this time I will spare him. And only add, that Mr. *Williams* acts so like unto these *Combinators*, that unless some more than ordinary care be taken to give check unto him, his success may bear some proportion to what *Laelius Socinus*, *Blandrata* and some others of that way, had in *Poland*. What Reputation *Blandrata* had amongst the Orthodox, notwithstanding the Indefatigable Pains of so great a Man, as *Calvin*, to discover his Hypocrisie, I have shown in my *Growth of Errour*, and in this place will observe what I have met with concerning *Franciscus Lismaninus*, who carried it so craftily, as to obtain a great Interest in the Esteem of the Reformed, in general, and of *Calvin* and *Zanchy*, in particular. *Lubieniecus*, in his *Polonian History*, lib. 2. c. 2. saith, that *Calvin*, in a Letter to the King of *Poland*, highly applauded *Lismaninus*, tho' the Publisher of his Epistles did unfairly omit the mention of his Name; and sure I am, that, he joyn'd with other *Polonian* Divines in a Letter to *Zanchy*, in which, he, with them, expresseth himself so Orthodoxly, that *Zanchy* in answer unto them could not but rejoyce exceedingly, to understand that so much Holiness and Truth was amongst them, which was about the year of our Lord 1562, 63. and yet long before this time *Wissowatius* dates *Lasmaninus* his

his being influenced by *Lalius Socinus* to embrace his *Opinions* even about the year 1552, 53. And it's very probable, the Concealment of his *Herese* from the Notice of the Orthodox, was continued unto the Day of his *Fatal Catastrophe*; [which, as *Sandius*, *Bibl. Anti-Trin.* p. 35. observes out of *Budzinus* his History, was by his falling into a Well. (where he was Drowned,) when in a *Phrensie*, occasion'd by his Wifes being suspected guilty of *Adultery*.] For it's conjectured, that his Death was not long after he joyn'd, in the above mentioned Letter, with *Gregorius Pauli*, *Stanislaus Lathomiski*, *Paulus Gilovius* & *Martinus Crovitius*, at that time *Socinians*, who by sheltering themselves amongst the Orthodox, had gain'd such Advantages for the Propagating their Impious Opinions, as to put an effectual stop to the spreading of the Truth in that Kingdom, which, for the most part, hath been ever since *Popish* and *Socinian*.

What I have said, will, I hope, clear it to them, who sincerely desire the Knowledge of what it is that doth really lye at the bottom of the present Heats, That our Differences are in Points of the greatest weight, and that the Contention on our part is, that the Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction may be secured from the Insults of *Mr. Ws.* and his followers. For, in a word, the true State of the Case is thus: *Mr. Williams* in his Writings, falling in with the Learned *Mr. Baxter*, hath corrupted the Doctrine of our Saviour's Satisfaction; The first Book, in which he laid the Foundation of the whole, he hath since advanced, came forth under the countenance of the *St. Hellens* Ministers, for above forty of their Hands are unto a Testimonial prefixed unto it. In which, it is declared, that the Truths, and Errours therein mentioned as such, are fully and rightly stated in
all

all *that* is material. Several Exceptions have been made against this Book, fervent desires that our Brethren, whose Hands are to it, would recall them. This never yet done, but when some of the most Eminent of our Brethren sent a Paper securing the Doctrines of Christ's Satisfaction, and our Justification, in opposition to Mr. *Williams* his Errours, which greatly rejoyced the hearts of the Grieved Brethren; a Check was put thereunto by them, who meet at *Little St. Hellens*, and another Paper composed, which broke down those Barriers which were inserted in the First Paper, on purpose to secure the *Truth* against the *Socinianizing-Arminians*. This last Paper encreasing the Offence given by Mr. *Williams*; the offended Brethren earnestly desired that they would joyn with the most Eminent of their own Number in the first Paper. To this never any Answer return'd, but various Misrepresentations given of Matters of Fact, which occasioned the Publishing a Sheet of Paper, entituld, *The Report*, &c. This is followed with a *Scandalous Rebuke*, written by Mr. *Alsop*, in which, without the least provocation he Rails against all the Congregational Churches, *Ministers* and *People*, calling 'em *Petty Foggers*, *Intreaguers*, *Whaffing Whelps*, *Mastiff Dogs*, *Rosacrutions*, and the like. Some time after this, out comes a Book called, *An Answer to the Report*, said by Mr. *Williams*, to be composed by a *Committee* of the *Saint Hellens Brethren*; to this are annexed two Letters, the one from the *R. Reverend the Lord Bishop of Worcester*, the other from the *Reverend Dr. Edwards*, *Principal of Jesus Colledge Oxon*, in which the Truths we own are explained and asserted.

Thus, instead of examining Mr. *Williams* his Book, and Recalling their Hands, or witnessing against the

the Errours in it, the Ministers at *Little St. Hellens*, who formerly took special care to keep themselves (as considered *collectively*) at a distance from the Contest, have now made themselves Parties, not only by their *Answer* to the *Report*, which contains in it a Plea for Mr. *Williams* his Notions, but also by their approval of Mr. *Alsop's* scurrulous and false Charge against the Congregational Brethren, which is not only evident from their not testifying against the Barbarity of the Abuse, but from their caressing him for it.

And whereas they say, the Difference is only about words, or modes of expression, you have it here fully proved that it is in such Points, as affect the very *Vitals of our Holy Religion*. For, Justification, by that *Righteousness of Christ which answers the Law of Works* is rejected, for a Righteousness of Christ which lyeth entirely and solely in the performance of the Conditions of the Mediatorial Covenant under which we never were. Besides, that Satisfaction, which lyeth in answering the Obligations of the Violated Law by Christ's suffering a proper Punishment is rejected, for a Satisfaction, which only answers some Remote Ends of the Law, which was done without Christ's bearing a proper Punishment. And that these things are of importance, I doubt not but my Lord *Bishop of Worcester*, and the *Principal of Jesus*, to whom I have *Appealed*, will with Conviction demonstrate.

But, whereas Mr. *Williams*, to drown the Charge against himself, makes a Noise of *Antinomianism* as embraced by the Congregational, it must be noted, that there was never any Charge brought in against them by Mr. *Williams*, or any other to the Ministers at *Little St. Hellens*, whilst they were amongst them, nor any where else that I know, nor did the Congregational

gregational set their Names to any Book chargeable with *Antinomianism*, unless three, or four of them, with as many more of their Presbyterian Brethren to a Testimonial before Dr. *Crisps* Book; which was before the *Union* commenced.

This being a short, but Impartial State of the Controversie, I do with the utmost Fervour beseech the Brethren who meet at *St. Hellens*, more particularly the Reverend Mr. *Hammond* to clear themselves from having any hand in approving of Mr. *Williams* and Mr. *Aisop's* unbrotherly False and Railing Accusations, whereby they will remove that Block, which they have thrown in the way, to hinder Conciliatory Endeavours, and greatly exhilarate the Spirits of their Injured and Grieved Brethren, who I doubt not, will concur with them in witnessing against the Errours on the other Extreme, if they at *St. Hellens* will but joyn heartily with them in Asserting those great Articles of Christ's Satisfaction and Merit, which have been very distinctly taught by the Church from the beginning, as *Vossius* and *Grotius* declare in the Preface to that Excellent Discourse of the Latter *De Satisfactione*, where it's said, *Cum vero duo nobis peperisse Christum dixerimus, Impunitatem. & Præmium, illud satisfactioni, hoc merito Christi distinctè Tribuit vetus Ecclesia*, both which are effectually secured in the *First Paper*.

A Learned Brother, whose Conciliating Attempts are very pleasing to me, having sent me his thoughts on this Controversie: I thank him heartily for it, craving his Opinion of my Appeal, and of this Discourse, that I may dispose of his Letter to the Churches greater Service.

F I N I S.